UPLAND COLLEGE LIBRARY
UPLAND, CALIFORNIA

Upland College
Library

This Volume Was
Presented
by

Dr. and Mrs. Henry G. Brubaker
Upland, California

UPLAND COLLEGE LIBRARY
UPLAND, CALIFORNIA

UPLAND COLLEGE LIBRARY
UPLAND, CALIFORNIA
82.
.F86
1917
v. 2

The Fundamentals

A Testimony to the Truth

"To the Law and to the Testimony"
Isaiah 8:20

VOLUME II

Published by
THE BIBLE INSTITUTE OF LOS ANGELES
536-558 SOUTH HOPE STREET
LOS ANGELES, CAL.

HIEBERT LIBRARY
Fresno Pacific College - M.B. Seminary

Copyrighted by
Bible Institute of Los Angeles
1917

8072

UPLAND COLLEGE LIBRARY
UPLAND, CALIFORNIA
8092

CONTENTS

VOLUME II

(The Fundamental set contains four volumes)

Chapter		Page
I.	THE INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE — DEFINITION, EXTENT AND PROOF. By Rev. James M. Gray, D. D., Dean of Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, Ill.	9
II.	INSPIRATION. By Evangelist L. W. Munhall, M. A., D. D., Germantown, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Author of "Highest Critics vs. Higher Critics."	44
III.	THE MORAL GLORY OF JESUS CHRIST, A PROOF OF INSPIRATION. By Rev. William G. Moorehead, D. D., President of Xenia Theological Seminary. Xenia, Ohio.	61
IV.	THE TESTIMONY OF THE SCRIPTURES TO THEMSELVES. By Rev. George S. Bishop, D. D., East Orange, New Jersey.	80
V.	TESTIMONY OF THE ORGANIC UNITY OF THE BIBLE TO ITS INSPIRATION. By the late Arthur T. Pierson.	97
VI.	FULFILLED PROPHECY A POTENT ARGUMENT FOR THE BIBLE. By Arno C. Gaebelein, Editor "Our Hope," New York City.	112
VII.	LIFE IN THE WORD. By Philip Mauro Attorney at Law, New York City.	144
	THEOLOGY	
VIII.	IS THERE A GOD? By Rev. Thomas Whitelaw, M. A., D. D., Kilmarnock, Scotland.	209
IX.	GOD IN CHRIST THE ONLY REVELATION OF THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD. By Robert E. Speer, Secretary of The Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., New York City.	224

CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
X.	THE DEITY OF CHRIST By Professor Benjamin B. Warfield, D. D., LL.D., Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey.	239
XI.	THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF CHRIST By Rev. Professor James Orr, D. D., United Free Church College, Glasgow, Scotland.	247
XII.	THE GOD-MAN By the Late John Stock.	261
XIII.	THE PERSON AND WORK OF JESUS CHRIST From "Some Recent Phases of German Theology," By Bishop Nuelsen, D. D., M. E. Church, Omaha, Nebraska.	282
XIV.	THE CERTAINTY AND IMPORTANCE OF THE BODILY RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST FROM THE DEAD By Rev. R. A. Torrey, D. D.	298
XV.	THE PERSONALITY AND DEITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT By Rev. R. A. Torrey, D. D.	323
XVI.	THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE SONS OF GOD By Rev. W. J. Erdman, D. D., Germantown, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.	338
XVII.	OBSERVATIONS ON THE CONVERSION AND APOSTLESHIP OF ST. PAUL By Lord Lyttelton, Analyzed and Condensed by Rev. J. L. Campbell, D. D., Cambridge, Mass.	353
XVIII.	CHRISTIANITY NO FABLE By Rev. Thomas Whitelaw, M. A., D. D., Kilmarnock, Ayreshire, Scotland.	367

PREFACE

In 1909 God moved two Christian laymen to set aside a large sum of money for issuing twelve volumes that would set forth the fundamentals of the Christian faith, and which were to be sent free to ministers of the gospel, missionaries, Sunday School superintendents, and others engaged in aggressive Christian work throughout the English speaking world. A committee of men who were known to be sound in the faith was chosen to have the oversight of the publication of these volumes. Rev. Dr. A. C. Dixon was the first Executive Secretary of the Committee, and upon his departure for England Rev. Dr. Louis Meyer was appointed to take his place. Upon the death of Dr. Meyer the work of the Executive Secretary devolved upon me. We were able to bring out these twelve volumes according to the original plan. Some of the volumes were sent to 300,000 ministers and missionaries and other workers in different parts of the world. On the completion of the twelve volumes as originally planned the work was continued through The King's Business, published at 536 South Hope St., Los Angeles, California. Although a larger number of volumes were issued than there were names on our mailing list, at last the stock became exhausted, but appeals for them kept coming in from different parts of the world. As the fund was no longer available for this purpose, the Bible Institute of Los Angeles, to whom the plates were turned over when the Committee closed its work, have decided to bring out the various articles that appeared in The Fundamentals in four volumes at the cheapest price possible. All the articles that appeared in The Fundamentals, with the exception of a very few that did not seem to be in exact keeping with the original purpose of The Fundamentals, will be published in this series.

R. A. TORREY,
Former Executive Secretary of the
Testimony Publishing Company.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/fundamentalstest0002vari

DEDICATION

To the two laymen whose generosity made it possible to send several millions of volumes of "The Fundamentals" to ministers and missionaries in all parts of the world, for their confirmation and upbuilding in the faith, these volumes are dedicated.

THE FUNDAMENTALS

VOLUME II

CHAPTER I

THE INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE—DEFINITION, EXTENT AND PROOF

BY REV. JAMES M. GRAY, D. D.,
DEAN OF MOODY BIBLE INSTITUTE, CHICAGO, ILL.

In this paper the authenticity and credibility of the Bible are assumed, by which is meant (1), that its books were written by the authors to whom they are ascribed, and that their contents are in all material points as when they came from their hands; and (2), that those contents are worthy of entire acceptance as to their statements of fact. Were there need to prove these assumptions, the evidence is abundant, and abler pens have dealt with it.

Let it not be supposed, however, that because these things are assumed their relative importance is undervalued. On the contrary, they underlie inspiration, and, as President Patton says, come in on the ground floor. They have to do with the historicity of the Bible, which for us just now is the basis of its authority. Nothing can be settled until this is settled, but admitting its settlement which, all things considered, we now may be permitted to do, what can be of deeper interest than the question as to how far that authority extends?

This is the inspiration question, and while so many have taken in hand to discuss the others, may not one be at liberty to discuss this? It is an old question, so old, indeed, as again in the usual recurrence of thought to have become new. Our

fathers discussed it, it was the great question once upon a time, it was sifted to the bottom, and a great storehouse of fact, and argument, and illustration has been left for us to draw upon in a day of need.

For a long while the enemy's attack has directed our energies to another part of the field, but victory there will drive us back here again. The other questions are outside of the Bible itself, this is inside. They lead men away from the contents of the book to consider how they came, this brings us back to consider what they are. Happy the day when the inquiry returns here, and happy the generation which has not forgotten how to meet it.

I. DEFINITION OF INSPIRATION

1. *Inspiration is not revelation.* As Dr. Charles Hodge expressed it, revelation is the act of communicating divine knowledge to the mind, but inspiration is the act of the same Spirit controlling those who make that knowledge known to others. In Chalmer's happy phrase, the one is the influx, the other the efflux. Abraham received the influx, he was granted a revelation; but Moses was endued with the efflux, being inspired to record it for our learning. In the one case there was a flowing in and in the other a flowing out. Sometimes both of these experiences met in the same person, indeed Moses himself is an illustration of it, having received a revelation at another time and also the inspiration to make it known, but it is of importance to distinguish between the two.

2. *Inspiration is not illumination.* Every regenerated Christian is illuminated in the simple fact that he is indwelt by the Holy Spirit, but every such an one is not also inspired, but only the writers of the Old and New Testaments. Spiritual illumination is subject to degrees, some Chrisitans possessing more of it than others, but, as we understand it, inspiration is not subject to degrees, being in every case the breath of God, expressing itself through a human personality.

3. *Inspiration is not human genius.* The latter is simply a natural qualification, however exalted it may be in some cases, but inspiration in the sense now spoken of is supernatural throughout. It is an enduement coming upon the writers of the Old and New Testaments directing and enabling them to write those books, and on no other men, and at no other time, and for no other purpose. No human genius of whom we ever heard introduced his writings with the formula, "Thus saith the Lord," or words to that effect, and yet such is the common utterance of the Bible authors. No human genius ever yet agreed with any other human genius as to the things it most concerns men to know, and, therefore, however exalted his equipment, it differs not merely in degree but in kind from the inspiration of the Scriptures.

In its mode the divine agency is inscrutable, though its effects are knowable. We do not undertake to say just how the Holy Spirit operated on the minds of these authors to produce these books any more than we undertake to say how He operates on the human heart to produce conversion, but we accept the one as we do the other on the testimony that appeals to faith.

4. When we speak of the Holy Spirit coming upon the men in order to the composition of the books, it should be further understood that *the object is not the inspiration of the men but the books*—not the writers but the *writings.* It terminates upon the record, in other words, and not upon the human instrument who made it.

To illustrate: Moses, David, Paul, John, were not always and everywhere inspired, for then always and everywhere they would have been infallible and inerrant, which was not the case. They sometimes made mistakes in thought and erred in conduct. But however fallible and errant they may have been as men compassed with infirmity like ourselves, such fallibility or errancy was never under any circumstances communicated to their sacred writings.

Ecclesiastes is a case in point, which on the supposition of its Solomonic authorship, is giving us a history of his search for happiness "under the sun." Some statements in that book are only partially true while others are altogether false, therefore it cannot mean that Solomon was inspired as he tried this or that experiment to find what no man has been able to find outside of God. But it means that his language is inspired as he records the various feelings and opinions which possessed him in the pursuit.

This disposes of a large class of objections sometimes brought against the doctrine of inspiration—those, for example, associated with the question as to whether the Bible is the Word of God or only contains that Word. If by the former be meant that God spake every word in the Bible, and hence that every word is true, the answer must be *no;* but if it be meant that God caused every word in the Bible, true or false, to be recorded, the answer should be *yes.* There are words of Satan in the Bible, words of false prophets, words of the enemies of Christ, and yet they are God's words, not in the sense that He uttered them, but that He caused them to be recorded, infallibly and inerrantly recorded, for our profit. In this sense the Bible does not merely contain the Word of God, it *is* the Word of God.

Of any merely human author it is the same. This paper is the writer's word throughout, and yet he may quote what other people say to commend them or dispute them. What they say he records, and in doing so he makes the record his in the sense that he is responsible for its accuracy.

5. Let it be stated further in this definitional connection, that *the record for whose inspiration we contend is the original record*—the autographs or parchments of Moses, David, Daniel, Matthew, Paul or Peter, as the case may be, and not any particular translation or translations of them whatever. There is no translation absolutely without error, nor could there be, considering the infirmities of human copyists, unless

God were pleased to perform a perpetual miracle to secure it.

But does this make nugatory our contention? Some would say it does, and they would argue speciously that to insist on the inerrancy of a parchment no living being has ever seen is an academic question merely, and without value. But do they not fail to see that the character and perfection of the Godhead are involved in that inerrancy?

Some years ago a "liberal" theologian, deprecating this discussion as not worth while, remarked that it was a matter of small consequence whether a pair of trousers were originally perfect if they were now rent. To which the valiant and witty David James Burrell replied, that it might be a matter of small consequence to the wearer of the trousers, but the tailor who made them would prefer to have it understood that they did not leave his shop that way. And then he added, that if the Most High must train among knights of the shears He might at least be regarded as the best of the guild, and One who drops no stitches and sends out no imperfect work.

Is it not with the written Word as with the incarnate Word? Is Jesus Christ to be regarded as imperfect because His character has never been perfectly reproduced before us? Can He be the incarnate Word unless He were absolutely without sin? And by the same token, can the scriptures be the written Word unless they were inerrant?

But if this question be so purely speculative and valueless, what becomes of the science of Biblical criticism by which properly we set such store today? Do builders drive piles into the soft earth if they never expect to touch bottom? Do scholars dispute about the scripture text and minutely examine the history and meaning of single words, "the delicate coloring of mood, tense and accent," if at the end there is no approximation to an absolute? As Dr. George H. Bishop says, does not our concordance, every time we take it up, speak loudly to us of a once inerrant parchment? Why do we not possess concordances for the very words of other books?

Nor is that original parchment so remote a thing as some suppose. Do not the number and variety of manuscripts and versions extant render it comparatively easy to arrive at a knowledge of its text, and does not competent scholarship today affirm that as to the New Testament at least, we have in 999 cases out of every thousand the very word of that original text? Let candid consideration be given to these things and it will be seen that we are not pursuing a phantom in contending for an inspired autograph of the Bible.

II. EXTENT OF INSPIRATION

1. *The inspiration of scripture includes the whole and every part of it.* There are some who deny this and limit it to only the prophetic portions, the words of Jesus Christ, and, say, the profounder spiritual teachings of the epistles. The historical books in their judgment, and as an example, do not require inspiration because their data were obtainable from natural sources.

The Bible itself, however, knows of no limitations, as we shall see: "*All* scripture is given by inspiration of God." The historical data, most of it at least, might have been obtained from natural sources, but what about the supernatural guidance required in their selection and narration? Compare, for answer, the records of creation, the fall, the deluge, etc., found in Genesis with those recently discovered by excavations in Bible lands. Do not the results of the pick-axe and the spade point to the same original as the Bible, and yet do not their childishness and grotesqueness often bear evidence of the human and sinful mould through which they ran? Do they not show the need of some power other than man himself to lead him out of the labyrinth of error into the open ground of truth?

Furthermore, are not the historical books in some respects the most important in the Bible? Are they not the bases of its doctrine? Does not the doctrine of sin need for its starting

point the record of the fall? Could we so satisfactorily understand justification did we not have the story of God's dealings with Abraham? And what of the priesthood of Christ? Dismiss Leviticus and what can be made of Hebrews? Is not the Acts of the Apostles historical, but can we afford to lose its inspiration?

And then, too, the historical books are, in many cases, prophetical as well as historical. Do not the types and symbols in them show forth the Saviour in all the varying aspects of His grace? Has not the story of Israel the closest relation as type and anti-type to our spiritual redemption? Does not Paul teach this in 1 Cor., 10:6-11? And if these things were thus written for our learning, does not this imply their inspiration?

Indeed, the historical books have the strongest testimony borne to their importance in other parts of the Bible. This will appear more particularly as we proceed, but take, in passing, Christ's use of Deuteronomy in His conflict with the tempter. Thrice does He overcome him by a citation from that historical book without note or comment. Is it not difficult to believe that neither He nor Satan considered it inspired?

Thus without going further, we may say, with Dr. DeWitt of Princeton, that it is impossible to secure the *religious* infalliability of the Bible—which is all the objector regards as necessary—if we exclude Bible history from the sphere of its inspiration. But if we include Bible history at all, we must include the whole of it, for who is competent to separate its parts?

2. *The inspiration includes not only all the books of the Bible in general but in detail, the form as well as the substance, the word as well as the thought.* This is sometimes called the *verbal* theory of inspiration and is vehemently spoken against in some quarters. It is too mechanical, it degrades the writers to the level of machines, it has a tendency to make skeptics, and all that.

This last remark, however, is not so alarming as it sounds.

The doctrine of the eternal retribution of the wicked is said to make skeptics, and also that of a vicarious atonement, not to mention other revelations of Holy Writ. The natural mind takes to none of these things. But if we are not prepared to yield the point in one case for such a reason, why should we be asked to do it in another?

And as to degrading the writers to the level of machines, even if it were true, as it is not, why should fault be found when one considers the result? Which is the more important, the free agency of a score or two of mortals, or the divinity of their message? The whole argument is just a spark from the anvil on which the race is ever trying to hammer out the deification of itself.

But we are insisting upon no theory—not even the verbal theory—if it altogether excludes the human element in the transmission of the sacred word. As Dr. Henry B. Smith says, "God speaks through the personality as well as the lips of His messengers," and we may pour into that word "personality" everything that goes to make it—the age in which the person lived, his environment, his degree of culture, his temperament and all the rest. As Wayland Hoyt expressed it, "Inspiration is not a mechanical, crass, bald compulsion of the sacred writers, but rather a dynamic, divine influence over their freely-acting faculties" in order that the latter in relation to the subject-matter then in hand may be kept inerrant, *i. e.*, without mistake or fault. It is limiting the Holy One of Israel to say that He is unable to do this without turning a human being into an automaton. Has He who created man as a free agent left himself no opportunity to mould his thoughts into forms of speech inerrantly expressive of His will, without destroying that which He has made?

And, indeed, wherein resides man's free agency, in his mind or in his mouth? Shall we say he is free while God controls his thought, but that he becomes a mere machine when that control extends to the *expression* of his thought?

But returning to the argument, if the divine influence upon the writers did not extend to the form as well as the substance of their writings; if, in other words, God gave them only the thought, permitting them to express it in their own words, what guarantee have we that they have done so?

An illustration the writer has frequently used will help to make this clear. A stenographer in a mercantile house was asked by his employer to write as follows:

"Gentlemen: We misunderstood your letter and will now fill your order."

Imagine the employer's surprise, however, when a little later this was set before him for his signature:

"Gentlemen: We misunderstood your letter and will *not* fill your order."

The mistake was only of a single letter, but it was entirely subversive of his meaning. And yet the thought was given clearly to the stenographer, and the words, too, for that matter. Moreover, the latter was capable and faithful, but he was human, and it is human to err. Had not his employer controlled his expression down to the very letter, the thought intended to be conveyed would have failed of utterance.

In the same way the human authors of the Bible were men of like passions with ourselves. Their motives were pure, their intentions good, but even if their subject-matter were the commonplaces of men, to say nothing of the mysterious and transcendent revelation of a holy God, how could it be an absolute transcript of the mind from which it came in the absence of miraculous control?

In the last analysis, it is the Bible itself, of course, which must settle the question of its inspiration and the extent of it, and to this we come in the consideration of the proof, but we may be allowed a final question. Can even God Himself give a thought to man without the words that clothe it? Are not the two inseparable, as much so "as a sum and its figures, or a tune and its notes?" Has any case been known in human his-

tory where a healthy mind has been able to create ideas without expressing them to its own perception? In other words, as Dr. A. J. Gordon once observed: "To deny that the Holy Spirit speaks in scripture is an intelligible proposition, but to admit that He speaks, it is impossible to know what He says except as we have His Words."

III. PROOF OF INSPIRATION

1. *The inspiration of the Bible is proven by the philosophy, or what may be called the nature of the case.*

The proposition may be stated thus: The Bible is the history of the redemption of the race, or from the side of the individual, a supernatural revelation of the will of God to men for their salvation. But it was given to certain men of one age to be conveyed in writing to other men in different ages. Now all men experience difficulty in giving faithful reflections of their thoughts to others because of sin, ignorance, defective memory and the inaccuracy always incident to the use of language.

Therefore it may be easily deduced that if the revelation is to be communicated precisely as originally received, the same supernatural power is required in the one case as in the other. This has been sufficiently elaborated in the foregoing and need not be dwelt upon again.

2. *It may be proven by the history and character of the Bible, i. e.,* by all that has been assumed as to its authenticity and credibility. All that goes to prove these things goes to prove its inspiration.

To borrow in part, the language of the Westminster Confession, "the heavenliness of its matter, the efficacy of its doctrine, the unity of its various parts, the majesty of its style and the scope and completeness of its design" all indicate the divinity of its origin.

The more we think upon it the more we must be convinced that men unaided by the Spirit of God could neither have con-

ceived, nor put together, nor preserved in its integrity that precious deposit known as the Sacred Oracles.

3. *But the strongest proof is the declarations of the Bible itself* and the inferences to be drawn from them. Nor is this reasoning in a circle as some might think. In the case of a man as to whose veracity there is no doubt, no hesitancy is felt in accepting what he says about himself; and since the Bible is demonstrated to be true in its statements of fact by unassailable evidence, may we not accept its witness in its own behalf?

Take the argument from Jesus Christ as an illustration. He was content to be tested by the prophecies that went before on Him, and the result of that ordeal was the establishment of His claims to be the Messiah beyond a peradventure. That complex system of prophecies, rendering collusion or counterfeit impossible, is the incontestable proof that He was what He claimed to be. But of course, He in whose birth, and life, and death, and resurrection such marvelous prophecies met their fulfilment, became, from the hour in which His claims were established, a witness to the divine authority and infallible truth of the sacred records in which these prophecies are found.—(The New Apologetic, by Professor Robert Watts, D. D.)

It is so with the Bible. The character of its contents, the unity of its parts, the fulfilment of its prophecies, the miracles wrought in its attestation, the effects it has accomplished in the lives of nations and of men, all these go to show that it is divine, and if so, that it may be believed in what it says about itself.

A. ARGUMENT FOR THE OLD TESTAMENT

To begin with the Old Testament, (*a*) consider how the writers speak of the origin of their messages. Dr. James H. Brookes is authority for saying that the phrase, "Thus saith the Lord" or its equivalent is used by them 2,000 times. Sup-

pose we eliminate this phrase and its necessary context from the Old Testament in every instance, one wonders how much of the Old Testament would remain.

(*b*) Consider how the utterances of the Old Testament writers are introduced into the New. Take Matthew 1:22 as an illustration, "Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Lord through the prophet." It was not the prophet who spake, but the Lord who spake through the prophet.

(*c*) Consider how Christ and His apostles regard the Old Testament. He came "not to destroy but to fulfill the law and the prophets." Matt. 5:17. "The Scripture cannot be broken." John 10:35. He sometimes used single words as the bases of important doctrines, twice in Matthew 22, at verses 31, 32 and 42-45. The apostles do the same. See Galatians 3:16, Hebrews 2:8, 11 and 12:26, 27.

(*d*) Consider what the apostles directly teach upon the subject. Peter tells us that "No prophecy ever came by the will of man, but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit" (2 Peter 1:21, R. V.). "Prophecy" here applies to the word written as is indicated in the preceding verse, and means not merely the foretelling of events, but the utterances of any word of God without reference as to time past, present or to come. As a matter of fact, what Peter declares is that the will of man had nothing to do with any part of the Old Testament, but that the whole of it, from Genesis to Malachi, was inspired by God.

Of course Paul says the same, in language even plainer, in 2 Timothy 3:16, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable." The phrase "inspiration of God" means literally *God-breathed*. The whole of the Old Testament is God-breathed, for it is to that part of the Bible the language particularly refers, since the New Testament as such was not then generally known.

As this verse is given somewhat differently in the Revised Version we dwell upon it a moment longer. It there reads, "Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable," and the caviller is disposed to say that therefore some scripture may be inspired and some may not be, and that the profitableness extends only to the former and not the latter.

But aside from the fact that Paul would hardly be guilty of such a weak truism as that, it may be stated in reply first, that the King James rendering of the passage is not only the more consistent scripture, but the more consistent Greek. Several of the best Greek scholars of the period affirm this, including some of the revisers themselves who did not vote for the change. And secondly, even the revisers place it in the margin as of practically equal authority with their preferred translation, and to be chosen by the reader if desired. There are not a few devout Christians, however, who would be willing to retain the rendering of the Revised Version as being stronger than the King James, and who would interpolate a word in applying it to make it mean, "Every scripture (*because*) inspired of God is also profitable." We believe that both Gaussen and Wordsworth take this view, two as staunch defenders of plenary inspiration as could be named.

B. ARGUMENT FOR THE NEW TESTAMENT

We are sometimes reminded that, however strong and convincing the argument for the inspiration of the Old Testament, that for the New Testament is only indirect. "Not one of the evangelists tells us that he is inspired," says a certain theological professor, "and not one writer of an epistle, except Paul."

We shall be prepared to dispute this statement a little further, but in the meantime let us reflect that the inspiration of the Old Testament being assured as it is, why should similar evidence be required for the New? Whoever is competent to speak as a Bible authority knows that the *unity* of the Old

and New Testaments is the strongest demonstration of their common source. They are seen to be not two books, but only two parts of one book.

To take then the analogy of the Old Testament. The foregoing argument proves its inspiration as a whole, although there were long periods separating the different writers, Moses and David let us say, or David and Daniel, the Pentateuch and the Psalms, or the Psalms and the Prophets. As long, or longer, than between Malachi and Matthew, or Ezra and the Gospels. If then to carry conviction for the plenary inspiration of the Old Testament as a whole, it is not necessary to prove it for every book, why, to carry conviction for the plenary inspiration of the *Bible* as a whole is it necessary to do the same?

We quote here a paragraph or two from Dr. Nathaniel West. He is referring to 2 Timothy 3:16, which he renders, "*Every* scripture is inspired of God," and adds:

"The distributive word 'Every' is used not only to particularize each individual scripture of the Canon that Timothy had studied from his youth, but also to include, along with the Old Testament the New Testament scriptures extant in Paul's day, and any others, such as those that John wrote after him.

"The Apostle Peter tells us that he was in possession, not merely of some of Paul's Epistles, but '*all* his Epistles,' and places them, canonically, in the same rank with what he calls 'the other scriptures,' *i. e.,* of equal inspiration and authority with the 'words spoken before by the Holy Prophets, and the commandment of the Lord and Savior, through the Apostles.' 2 Peter 3:2, 16.

"Paul teaches the same co-ordination of the Old and New Testaments. Having referred to the Old as a unit, in his phrase 'Holy Scriptures,' which the revisers translate 'Sacred Writings,' he proceeds to particularize. He tells Timothy that 'every scripture,' whether of Old or New Testament production, 'is inspired of God.' Let it be in the Pentateuch, the Psalms, the Prophets, the Historical Books, let it be a

chapter or a verse; let it be in the Gospels, the Acts, his own or Peter's Epistles, or even John's writings, yet to be, still each part of the Sacred Collection is God-given and because of that possesses divine authority as part of the Book of God."

We read this from Dr. West twenty years ago, and rejected it as his dictum. We read it today, with deeper and fuller knowledge of the subject, and we believe it to be true.

It is somewhat as follows that Dr. Gaussen in his exhaustive "Theopneustia" gives the argument for the inspiration of the New Testament.

(*a*) The New Testament is the later, and for that reason the more important revelation of the two, and hence if the former were inspired, it certainly must be true of the latter. The opening verses of the first and second chapters of Hebrews plainly suggest this: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son * * * *Therefore* we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard."

And this inference is rendered still more conclusive by the circumstance that the New Testament sometimes explains, sometimes proves, and sometimes even repeals ordinances of the Old Testament. See Matthew 1:22, 23 for an illustration of the first, Acts 13:19 to 39 for the second and Galatians 5:6 for the third. Assuredly these things would not be true if the New Testament were not of equal, and in a certain sense, even greater authority than the Old.

(*b*) The writers of the New Testament were of an equal or higher rank than those of the Old. That they were prophets is evident from such allusions as Romans 16:25-27, and Ephesians 3:4, 5. But that they were more than prophets is indicated in the fact that wherever in the New Testament prophets and apostles are both mentioned, the last-named is always mentioned first (see 1 Cor. 12:28, Ephesians 2:20,

Ephesians 4:11). It is also true that the writers of the New Testament had a higher mission than those of the Old, since they were sent forth by Christ, as he had been sent forth by the Father (John 20:21). They were to go, not to a single nation only (as Israel), but into all the world (Matthew 28:19). They received the keys of the kingdom of heaven (Matthew 16:19). And they are to be pre-eminently rewarded in the regeneration (Matthew 19:28). Such considerations and comparisons as these are not to be overlooked in estimating the authority by which they wrote.

(*c*) The writers of the New Testament were especially qualified for their work, as we see in Matthew 10:19, 20, Mark 13:11, Luke 12:2, John 14:26 and John 16:13, 14. These passages will be dwelt on more at length in a later division of our subject, but just now it may be noticed that in some of the instances, inspiration of the most absolute character was promised as to what they should *speak*—the inference being warranted that none the less would they be guided in what they wrote. Their spoken words were limited and temporary in their sphere, but their written utterances covered the whole range of revelation and were to last forever. If in the one case they were inspired, how much more in the other?

(*d*) The writers of the New Testament directly claim divine inspiration. See Acts 15:23-29, where, especially at verse 28, James is recorded as saying, "for it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things." Here it is affirmed very clearly that the Holy Ghost is the real writer of the letter in question and simply using the human instruments for his purpose. Add to this 1 Corinthians 2:13, where Paul says: "Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual," or as the margin of the Revised Version puts it, "imparting spiritual things to spiritual men." In 1 Thessalonians 2:13 the same writer says: "For this cause also thank

we God without ceasing, because when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of man, but as it is in truth the word of God." In 2 Peter 3:2 the apostle places his own words on a level with those of the prophets of the Old Testament, and in verses 15 and 16 of the same chapter he does the same with the writings of Paul, classifying them "with the other scriptures." Finally, in Revelation 2:7, although it is the Apostle John who is writing, he is authorized to exclaim: "He that hath an ear let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches," and so on throughout the epistles to the seven churches.

C. ARGUMENT FOR THE WORDS

The evidence that the inspiration includes the form as well as the substance of the Holy Scriptures, the word as well as the thought, may be gathered in this way.

1. *There were certainly some occasions when the words were given to the human agents.* Take the instance of Balaam (Numbers 22:38, 23:12, 16). It is clear that this self-seeking prophet *thought, i. e.,* desired to speak differently from what he did, but was obliged to speak the word that God put in his mouth. There are two incontrovertible witnesses to this, one being Balaam himself and the other God.

Take Saul (1 Samuel 10:10), or at a later time, his messengers (19:20-24). No one will claim that there was not an inspiration of the words here. And Caiaphas also (John 11:49-52), of whom it is expressly said that when he prophesied that one man should die for the people, "this spake he not of himself." Who believes that Caiaphas meant or really knew the significance of what he said?

And how entirely this harmonizes with Christ's promise to His disciples in Matthew 10:19, 20 and elsewhere. "When they deliver you up take no thought (be not anxious) how or what ye shall speak; for it shall be given you in that hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak but the Spirit

of your Father which speaketh in you." Mark is even more emphatic: "Neither do ye *premeditate,* but whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye, for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost."

Take the circumstance of the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:4-11), when the disciples "began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance." Parthians, Medes, Elamites, the dwellers in Mesopotamia, in Judea, Cappadocia, Pontus, Asia, Phrygia, Pamphylia, Egypt, in the parts of Libya about Cyrene, the strangers of Rome, Cretes and Arabians all testified, "we do here them speak in our tongues the wonderful works of God!" Did not this inspiration include the words? Did it not indeed *exclude* the thought? What clearer example could be desired?

To the same purport consider Paul's teaching in 1 Corinthians 14 about the gift of tongues. He that speaketh in an unknown tongue, in the Spirit speaketh mysteries, but no man understandeth him, therefore he is to pray that he may interpret. Under some circumstances, if no interpreter be present, he is to keep silence in the church and speak only to himself and to God.

But better still, consider the utterance of 1 Peter 1:10, 11, where he speaks of them who prophesied of the grace that should come, as "searching what, or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify when He testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow, to whom it was revealed," etc.

"Should we see a student who, having taken down the lecture of a profound philosopher, was now studying diligently to comprehend the sense of the discourse which he had written, we should understand simply that he was a pupil and not a master; that he had nothing to do with originating either the thoughts or the words of the lecture, but was rather a disciple whose province it was to understand what he had transcribed, and so be able to communicate it to others.

"And who can deny that this is the exact picture of what we have in this passage from Peter? Here were inspired writers studying the meaning of what they themselves had written. With all possible allowance for the human peculiarities of the writers, they must have been reporters of what they heard, rather than formulators of that which they had been made to understand."—A. J. Gordon in "The Ministry of the Spirit," pp. 173, 174.

2. *The Bible plainly teaches that inspiration extends to its words.* We spoke of Balaam as uttering that which God put in his mouth, but the same expression is used by God Himself with reference to His prophets. When Moses would excuse himself from service because he was not eloquent, He who made man's mouth said, "Now therefore go, and I will be with thy mouth, and teach thee what thou shalt say" (Exodus 4:10-12). And Dr. James H. Brookes' comment is very pertinent. "God did not say I will be with thy mind, and teach thee what thou shalt think; but I will be with thy mouth and teach thee what thou shalt say. This explains why, forty years afterwards, Moses said to Israel, 'Ye shall not add unto the word I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it.' (Deut. 4:2.)" Seven times Moses tells us that the tables of stone containing the commandments were the work of God, and the writing was the writing of God, graven upon the tables (Exodus 31:16).

Passing from the Pentateuch to the poetical books we find David saying, "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and His word was in my tongue" (2 Samuel 23:1, 2). He, too, does not say, God thought by me, but spake by me.

Coming to the prophets, Jeremiah confesses that, like Moses, he recoiled from the mission on which he was sent and for the same reason. He was a child and could not speak. "Then the Lord put forth His hand and touched my mouth. And the Lord said unto me, Behold I have put My word in thy mouth" (Jeremiah 1:6-9).

All of which substantiates the declaration of Peter quoted earlier, that "no prophecy ever came by the will of man, but man spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit." Surely, if the will of man had *nothing* to do with the prophecy, he could not have been at liberty in the selection of the words.

So much for the Old Testament, but when we reach the New, we have the same unerring and verbal accuracy guaranteed to the apostles by the Son of God, as we have seen. And we have the apostles making claim of it, as when Paul in 1 Corinthians 2:12, 13 distinguishes between the "things" or the thoughts which God gave him and the words in which he expressed them, and insisting on the divinity of both; "Which things also we speak," he says, "not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." In Galatians 3:16, following the example of His divine Master, he employs not merely a single word, but a single letter of a word as the basis of an argument for a great doctrine. The blessing of justification which Abraham received has become that of the believer in Jesus Christ. "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy *seed*, which is Christ."

The writer of the epistle to the Hebrews bases a similar argument on the word "all" in chapter 1:8, on the word "one" in 1:11, and on the phrase "yet once more" in 12:26, 27.

To recur to Paul's argument in Galatians, Archdeacon Farrar in one of his writings denies that by any possibility such a Hebraist as he, and such a master of Greek usage could have argued in this way. He says Paul must have known that the plural of the Hebrew and Greek terms for "seed" is never used by Hebrew or Greek writers to designate human offspring. It means, he says, various kinds of grain.

His artlessness is amusing. We accept his estimate of Paul's knowledge of Hebrew and Greek, says Professor Watts, he was certainly a Hebrew of the Hebrews, and as to his Greek he could not only write it but speak it as we know,

and quote what suited his purpose from the Greek poets. But on this supposition we feel justified in asking Dr. Farrar whether a lexicographer in searching Greek authors for the meanings they attached to *spèrmata,* the Greek for "seeds," would not be inclined to add "human offspring" on so good an authority as Paul?

Nor indeed would they be limited to his authority, since Sophocles uses it in the same way, and Aeschylus. "I was driven away from my country by my own offspring" (*spèrmata*)—literally by my own seeds, is what the former makes one of his characters say.

Dr. Farrar's rendering of *spèrmata* in Galatians 3:16 on the other hand would make nonsense if not sacrilege. "He saith not unto various kinds of grain as of many, but as of one, and to thy grain, which is Christ."

"Granting then, what we thank no man for granting, that *spèrmata* means human offspring, it is evident that despite all opinions to the contrary, this passage sustains the teaching of an inspiration of Holy Writ extending to its very words."

3. *But the most unique argument for the inspiration of the words of scripture is the relation which Jesus Christ bears to them.* In the first place, He Himself was inspired as to His words. In the earliest reference to His prophetic office (Deut. 18:18), Jehovah says, "I will put My words in His mouth, and He shall speak * * * all that I shall command Him." A limitation on His utterance which Jesus everywhere recognizes. "As My Father hath taught Me, I speak these things;" "the Father which sent Me, He gave Me a commandment what I should say, and what I should speak;" "whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto Me, so I speak;" "I have given unto them the words which Thou gavest Me;" "the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." (John 6:63; 8:26, 28, 40; 12:49, 50.)

The thought is still more impressive as we read of the relation of the Holy Spirit to the God-man. "The Spirit of

the Lord is upon Me because He hath annointed Me to preach the gospel to the poor;" "He through the Holy Ghost had given commandments unto the apostles;" "the revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto Him;" "these things saith He that holdeth the seven stars in His right hand;" "He that hath an ear let him hear what the *Spirit* saith unto the churches" (Luke 4:18; Acts 1:2; Rev. 1:1; 2:1, 11). If the incarnate Word needed the unction of the Holy Ghost to give to men the revelation He received from the Father in Whose bosom He dwells; and if the agency of the same Spirit extended to the words He spake in preaching the gospel to the meek or dictating an epistle, how much more must these things be so in the case of ordinary men when engaged in the same service? With what show of reason can one contend that any Old or New Testament writer stood, so far as his words were concerned, in need of no such agency."—The New Apologetic, pp. 67, 68.

In the second place He used the scriptures as though they were inspired as to their words. In Matthew 22:31, 32, He substantiates the doctrine of the resurrection against the skepticism of the Sadducees by emphasizing the present tense of the verb "to be," *i. e.*, the word "am" in the language of Jehovah to Moses at the burning bush. In verses 42-45 of the same chapter He does the same for His own Deity by alluding to the second use of the word "Lord" in Psalm CX. "The LORD said unto my Lord * * * If David then call him Lord, how is he his son?" In John 10:34-36, He vindicates Himself from the charge of blasphemy by saying, "Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? If He called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken; say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?"

We have already seen Him (in Matthew 4) overcoming the tempter in the wilderness by three quotations from Deuter-

onomy without note or comment except, *"It is written."* Referring to which Adolphe Monod says, "I know of nothing in the whole history of humanity, nor even in the field of divine revelation, that proves more clearly than this the inspiration of the scriptures. What! Jesus Christ, the Lord of heaven and earth, calling to his aid in that solemn moment Moses his servant? He who speaks from heaven fortifying himself against the temptations of hell by the word of him who spake from earth? How can we explain that spiritual mystery, that wonderful reversing of the order of things, if for Jesus the words of Moses were not the words of God rather than those of men? How shall we explain it if Jesus were not fully aware that holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost?

"I do not forget the objections which have been raised against the inspiration of the scriptures, nor the real obscurity with which that inspiration is surrounded; if they sometimes trouble your hearts, they have troubled mine also. But at such times, in order to revive my faith, I have only to glance at Jesus glorifying the scriptures in the wilderness; and I have seen that for all who rely upon Him, the most embarrassing of problems is transformed into a historical fact, palpable and clear. Jesus no doubt was aware of the difficulties connected with the inspiration of the scriptures, but did this prevent Him from appealing to their testimony with unreserved confidence? Let that which was sufficient for Him suffice for you. Fear not that the rock which sustained the Lord in the hour of His temptation and distress will give way because you lean too heavily upon it."

In the third place, Christ teaches that the scriptures are inspired as to their words. In the Sermon on the Mount He said, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled."

Here is testimony confirmed by an oath, for "verily" on the lips of the Son of Man carries such force. He affirms the indestructibility of the law, not its substance merely but its form, not the thought but the word.

"One jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law." The "jot" means the *yod,* the smallest letter in the Hebrew alphabet, while the "tittle" means the *horn,* a short projection in certain letters extending the base line beyond the upright one which rests upon it. A reader unaccustomed to the Hebrew needs a strong eye to see the tittle, but Christ guarantees that as a part of the sacred text neither the tittle nor the yod shall perish.

The elder Lightfoot, the Hebraist and rabbinical scholar of the Westminster Assembly time, has called attention to an interesting story of a certain letter *yod* found in the text of Deut. 32:18. It is in the word *teshi,* to forsake, translated in the King James as "unmindful." Originally it seems to have been written smaller even than usual, *i. e.,* undersized, and yet notwithstanding the almost infinite number of times in which copies have been made, that little *yod* stands there today just as it ever did. Lightfoot spoke of it in the middle of the seventeenth century, and although two more centuries and a half have passed since then with all their additional copies of the book, yet it still retains its place in the sacred text. Its diminutive size is referred to in the margin, "but no hand has dared to add a hair's breadth to its length," so that we can still employ his words, and say that it is likely to remain there forever.

The same scholar speaks of the effect a slight change in the form of a Hebrew letter might produce in the substance of the thought for which it stands. He takes as an example two words, "Chalal" and "Halal," which differ from each other simply in their first radicals. The "Ch" in Hebrew is expressed by one letter the same as "H," the only distinction being a slight break or opening in the left limb of the latter. It

seems too trifling to notice, but let that line be broken where it should be continuous, and "Thou shalt not *profane* the Name of thy God" in Leviticus 18:21, becomes "Thou shalt not *praise* the Name of thy God." Through that aperture, however small, the entire thought of the Divine mind oozes out, so to speak, and becomes quite antagonistic to what was designed.

This shows how truly the thought and the word expressing it are bound together, and that whatever affects the one imperils the other. As another says, "The bottles are not the wine, but if the bottles perish, the wine is sure to be spilled." It may seem like narrow-mindedness to contend for this, and an evidence of enlightenment or liberal scholarship to treat it with indifference, but we should be prepared to take our stand with Jesus Christ in the premises, and if necessary, go outside the camp bearing our reproach.

IV. DIFFICULTIES AND OBJECTIONS

That there are difficulties in the way of accepting a view of inspiration like this goes without saying. But to the finite mind there must always be difficulties connected with a revelation from the Infinite, and it can not be otherwise. This has been mentioned before. Men of faith, and it is such we are addressing, and not men of the world, do not wait to understand or resolve all the difficulties associated with other mysteries of the Bible before accepting them as divine, and why should they do so in this case?

Moreover, Archbishop Whately's dictum is generally accepted, that we are not obliged to clear away every difficulty about a doctrine in order to believe it, always provided that the facts on which it rests are true. And particularly is this the case where the rejection of such a doctrine involves greater difficulties than its belief, as it does here.

For if this view of inspiration be rejected, what have its opponents to give in its place? Do they realize that any objections to it are slight in comparison with those to any

other view that can be named? And do they realize that this is true because this view has the immeasurable advantage of agreeing with the plain declarations of Scripture on the subject? In other words, as Dr. Burrell says, those who assert the inerrancy of the scripture autographs do so on the authority of God Himself, and to deny it is of a piece with the denial that they teach the forgiveness of sins or the resurrection from the dead. No amount of exegetical turning and twisting can explain away the assertions already quoted in these pages, to say nothing of the constant undertone of evidence we find in the Bible everywhere to their truth.

And speaking of this further, are we not justified in requiring of the objector two things? First, on any fair basis of scientific investigation, is he not obliged to dispose of the evidence here presented before he impugns the doctrine it substantiates? And second, after having disposed of it, is he not equally obligated to present the scriptural proof of whatever other view of inspiration he would have us accept? Has he ever done this, and if not, are we not further justified in saying that it can not be done? But let us consider some of the difficulties.

1. *There are the so-called discrepancies or contradictions between certain statements of the Bible and the facts of history or natural science.* The best way to meet these is to treat them separately as they are presented, but when you ask for them you are not infrequently met with silence. They are hard to produce, and when produced, who is able to say that they belong to the original parchments? As we are not contending for an inerrant translation, does not the burden of proof rest with the objector?

But some of these "discrepancies" are easily explained. They do not exist between statements of the Bible and facts of science, but between erroneous interpretations of the Bible and immature conclusions of science. The old story of Galileo is in point, who did not contradict the Bible in affirming that

the earth moved round the sun but only the false theological assumptions about it. In this way advancing light has removed many of these discrepancies, and it is fair to presume with Dr. Charles Hodge that further light would remove all.

2. *There are the differences in the narratives themselves.* In the first place, the New Testament writers sometimes change important words in quoting from the Old Testament, which it is assumed could not be the case if in both instances the writers were inspired. But it is forgotten that in the scriptures we are dealing not so much with different human authors as with one Divine Author. It is a principle in ordinary literature that an author may quote himself as he pleases, and give a different turn to an expression here and there as a changed condition of affairs renders it necessary or desirable. Shall we deny this privilege to the Holy Spirit? May we not find, indeed, that some of these supposed misquotations show such progress of truth, such evident application of the teaching of an earlier dispensation to the circumstances of a later one, as to afford a confirmation of their divine origin rather than an argument against it?

We offered illustrations of this earlier, but to those would now add Isaiah 59:20 quoted in Romans 11:26, and Amos 9:11 quoted in Acts 15:16. And to any desiring to further examine the subject we would recommend the valuable work of Professor Franklin Johnson, of Chicago University, entitled "The Quotations in the New Testament from the Old."

Another class of differences, however, is where the *same event* is sometimes given differently by different writers. Take that most frequently used by the objectors, the inscription on the cross, recorded by all the evangelists and yet differently by each. How can such records be inspired, it is asked.

It is to be remembered in reply, that the inscription was written in three languages calling for a different arrangement of the words in each case, and that one evangelist may have translated the Hebrew, and another the Latin, while a third

recorded the Greek. It is not said that any one gave the *full* inscription, nor can we affirm that there was any obligation upon them to do so. Moreover, no one contradicts any other, and no one says what is untrue.

Recalling what was said about our having to deal not with different human authors but with one Divine Author, may not the Holy Spirit here have chosen to emphasize some one particular fact, or phase of a fact of the inscription for a specific and important end? Examine the records to determine what this fact may have been. Observe that whatever else is omitted, all the narratives record the momentous circumstances that the Sufferer on the cross was THE KING OF THE JEWS.

Could there have been a cause for this? What was the charge preferred against Jesus by His accusers? Was He not rejected and crucified because He said He was the King of the Jews? Was not this the central idea Pilate was providentially guided to express in the inscription? And if so, was it not that to which the evangelists should bear witness? And should not that witness have been borne in a way to dispel the thought of collusion in the premises? And did not this involve a variety of narrative which should at the same time be in harmony with truth and fact? And do we not have this very thing in the four gospels?

These accounts supplement, but do not contradict each other. We place them before the eye in the order in which they are recorded.

This is Jesus	THE KING OF THE JEWS
	THE KING OF THE JEWS
This is	THE KING OF THE JEWS
Jesus of Nazareth	THE KING OF THE JEWS

The entire inscription evidently was "This is Jesus of Nazareth the King of the Jews," but we submit that the foregoing presents a reasonable argument for the differences in the records.

3. *There is the variety in style.* Some think that if all the writers were alike inspired and the inspiration extended to their words, they must all possess the same style—as if the Holy Spirit had but one style!

Literary style is a method of selecting words and putting sentences together which stamps an author's work with the influence of his habits, his condition in society, his education, his reasoning, his experience, his imagination and his genius. These give his mental and moral physiognomy and make up his style.

But is not God free to act with or without these fixed laws? There are no circumstances which tinge His views or reasonings, and He has no idiosyncrasies of speech, and no mother tongue through which He expresses His character, or leaves the finger mark of genius upon His literary fabrics.

It is a great fallacy then, as Dr. Thomas Armitage once said, to suppose that uniformity of verbal style must have marked God's authorship in the Bible, had He selected its words. As the author of all styles, rather does he use them all at his pleasure. He bestows all the powers of mental individuality upon His instruments for using the scriptures, and then uses their powers as He will to express His mind by them.

Indeed, the variety of style is a necessary proof of the freedom of the human writers, and it is this which among other things convinces us that, however controlled by the Holy Spirit, they were not mere machines in what they wrote.

Consider God's method in nature. In any department of vegetable life there may be but one genus, while its members are classified into a thousand species. From the bulbous root come the tulip, the hyacinth, the crocus, and the lily in every shape and shade, without any cause either of natural chemistry or culture. It is exclusively attributable to the variety of styles which the mind of God devises. And so in the sacred writings. His mind is seen in the infinite variety of expression which dictates the wording of every book. To

quote Armitage again, "I cannot tell how the Holy Spirit suggested the words to the writers any more than some other man can tell how He suggested the thoughts to them. But if diversity of expression proves that He did not choose the words, the diversity of ideas proves that He did not dictate the thoughts, for the one is as varied as the other."

William Cullen Bryant was a newspaper man but a poet; Edmund Clarence Stedman was a Wall Street broker and also a poet. What a difference in style there was between their editorials and commercial letters on the one hand, and their poetry on the other! Is God more limited than a man?

4. *There are certain declarations of scripture itself.* Does not Paul say in one or two places "I speak as a man," or "After the manner of man?" Assuredly, but is he not using the arguments common among men for the sake of elucidating a point? And may he not as truly be led of the Spirit to do that, and to record it, as to do or say anything else? Of course, what he quotes from men is not of the same essential value as what he receives directly from God, but the *record* of the quotation is as truly inspired.

There are two or three other utterances of his of this character in the 7th chapter of 1 Corinthians, where he is treating of marriage. At verse 6 he says, "I speak this by permission, not of commandment," and what he means has no reference to the source of his message but the subject of it. In contradiction to the false teaching of some, he says Christians are permitted to marry, but not commanded to do so. At verse 10 he says, "Unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord," while at verse 12 there follows, "but to the rest speak I, not the Lord." Does he declare himself inspired in the first instance, and not in the second? By no means, but in the first he is alluding to what the Lord spake on the subject while here in the flesh, and in the second to what he, Paul, is adding thereto on the authority of the Holy Spirit speaking through him. In other words, putting his own utterances on

equality with those of our Lord, he simply confirms their inspiration.

At verse 40 he uses a puzzling expression, "I think also that I have the Spirit of God." As we are contending only for an inspired record, it would seem easy to say that here he records a doubt as to whether he was inspired, and hence everywhere else in the absence of such record of doubt the inspiration is to be assumed. But this would be begging the question, and we prefer the solution of others that the answer is found in the condition of the Corinthian church at that time. His enemies had sought to counteract his teachings, claiming that they had the Spirit of God. Referring to the claim, he says with justifiable irony, "I think also that I have the Spirit of God" (R. V.). "I think" in the mouth of one having apostolic authority, says Professor Watts, may be taken as carrying the strongest assertion of the judgment in question. The passage is something akin to another in the same epistle at the 14th chapter, verse 37, where he says, "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord."

Time forbids further amplification on the difficulties and objections nor is it necessary, since there is not one that has not been met satisfactorily to the man of God and the child of faith again and again.

But there is an obstacle to which we would call attention before concluding—not a difficulty or objection, but a real obstacle, especially to the young and insufficiently instructed. It is the illusion that this view of inspiration is held only by the unlearned. An illusion growing out of still another as to who constitute the learned.

There is a popular impression that in the sphere of theology and religion these latter are limited for the most part to the higher critics and their relatives, and the more rationalistic and iconoclastic the critic the more learned he is esteemed to be.

But the fallacy of this is seen in that the qualities which make for a philologist, an expert in human languages, or which give one a wide acquaintance with literature of any kind, in other words the qualities of the higher critic, depend more on memory than judgment, and do not give the slightest guarantee that their possessors can draw a sound conclusion from what they know.

As the author of "Faith and Inspiration" puts it, the work of such a scholar is often like that of a quarryman to an architect. Its entire achievement, though immensely valuable in its place, is just a mass of raw and formless material until a mind gifted in a different direction, and possessing the necessary taste and balance shall reduce or put it into shape for use. The perplexities of astronomers touching Halley's comet is in point. They knew facts that common folks did not know, but when they came to generalize upon them, the man on the street knew that he should have looked in the west for the phenomenon when they bade him look in the east.

Much is said for example about an acquaintance with Hebrew and Greek, and no sensible man will underrate them for the theologian or the Bible scholar, but they are entirely unnecessary to an understanding of the doctrine of inspiration or any other doctrine of Holy Writ. The intelligent reader of the Bible in the English tongue, especially when illuminated by the Holy Spirit, is abundantly able to decide upon these questions for himself. He cannot determine how the Holy Spirit operated on the minds of the sacred penmen because that is not revealed, but he can determine on the results secured because that *is* revealed. He can determine whether the inspiration covers all the books, and whether it includes not only the substance but the form, not only the thoughts but the words.

We have spoken of scholars and of the learned, let us come to names. We suppose Dr. Sanday, of Oxford, is a scholar, and the Archbishop of Durham, and Dean Burgon, and Pro-

fessor Orr, of Glasgow, and Principal Forsyth, of Hackney College, and Sir Robert Anderson, and Dr. Kuyper, of Holland, and President Patton, of Princeton, and Howard Osgood of the Old Testament Revision Committee and Matthew B. Riddle of the New, and G. Frederick Wright and Albert T. Clay, the archaeologists, and Presidents Moorehead and Mullins, and C. I. Scofield, and Luther T. Townsend, for twenty-five years professor in the Theological School of Boston University, and Arthur T. Pierson of the Missionary Review of the World, and a host of other living witnesses—Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, Lutherans, Methodists, Reformed Dutch.

We had thought John Calvin a scholar, and the distinguished Bengel, and Canon Faussett, and Tregelles, and Auberlen, and Van Oosterzee, and Charles Hodge and Henry B. Smith, and so many more that it were foolishness to recall them. These men may not stand for every statement in these pages, they might not care to be quoted as holding technically the verbal theory of inspiration for reasons already named, but they will affirm the heart of the contention and testify to their belief in an inspiration of the Sacred Oracles which includes the words.

Once when the writer was challenged by the editor of a secular daily to name a single living scholar who thus believed, he presented that of a chancellor of a great university, and was told that he was not the kind of scholar that was meant! The kind of scholar not infrequently meant by such opposers is the one who is seeking to destroy faith in the Bible as the Word of God, and to substitute in its place a Bible of his own making.

The *Outlook* had an editorial recently, entitled "Whom Shall We Believe?" in which the writer reaffirmed the platitudes that living is a vital much more than an intellectual process, and that truth of the deeper kind is distilled out of experience rather than logical processes. This is the reason he said why many things are hidden from the so-called wise,

who follow formal methods of exact observation, and are revealed to babes and sucklings who know nothing of these methods, but are deep in the process of living. No spectator ever yet understood a great contemporary human movement into which he did not enter.

Does this explain why the cloistered scholar is unable to accept the supernatural inspiration of the scriptures while the men on the firing line of the Lord's army believe in it even to the very words? Does it explain the faith of our missionaries in foreign lands? Is this what led J. Hudson Taylor to Inland China, and Dr. Guinness to establish the work upon the Congo, and George Müeller and William Quarrier to support the orphans at Bristol and the Bridge of Weirs? Is this—the belief in the plenary inspiration of the Bible—the secret of the evangelistic power of D. L. Moody, and Chapman, and Torrey, and Gipsy Smith, and practically every evangelist in the field, for to the extent of our acquaintance there are none of these who doubt it? Does this tell why "the best sellers on the market," at least among Christian people, have been the devotional and expository books of Andrew Murray, and Miller and Meyer, and writers of that stamp? Is this why the plain people have loved to listen to preachers like Spurgeon, and McLaren, and Campbell Morgan, and Len Broughton and A. C. Dixon and have passed by men of the other kind? It is, in a word, safe to challenge the whole Christian world for the name of a man who stands out as a winner of souls who does not believe in the inspiration of the Bible as it has been sought to be explained in these pages.

But we conclude with a kind of concrete testimony—that of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of America, and of a date as recent as 1893. The writer is not a Presbyterian, and therefore with the better grace can ask his readers to consider the character and the intellect represented in such an Assembly. Here are some of our greatest merchants, our greatest jurists, our greatest educators, our great-

est statesmen, as well as our greatest missionaries, evangelists and theologians. There may be seen as able and august a gathering of representatives of Christianity in other places and on other occasions, but few that can surpass it. For sobriety of thought, for depth as well as breadth of learning, for wealth of spiritual experience, for honesty of utterance, and virility of conviction, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America must command attention and respect throughout the world. And this is what it said on the subject we are now considering at its gathering in the city of Washington, the capital of the nation, at the date named:

"THE BIBLE AS WE NOW HAVE IT, IN ITS VARIOUS TRANSLATIONS AND REVISIONS, WHEN FREED FROM ALL ERRORS AND MISTAKES OF TRANSLATORS, COPYISTS AND PRINTERS, (IS) THE VERY WORD OF GOD, AND CONSEQUENTLY WHOLLY WITHOUT ERROR."

CHAPTER II

INSPIRATION

BY EVANGELIST L. W. MUNHALL, M. A., D. D.,
GERMANTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA,

AUTHOR OF "THE HIGHEST CRITICS VS. THE HIGHER CRITICS"

The Bible is inspired. It is therefore God's Word. This is fundamental to the Christian faith. "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God" (Rom. 10: 17).

But, it is asked, What do you mean by inspiration? Because there are numerous theories of inspiration, this is a proper question. Also, it is well, before answering the question, to state some of these theories. First, "The thoughts of the penman were inspired." Second, "The thoughts were partially inspired." But they who hold to this view are very indefinite in their statements of the extent of this inspiration. Third, "There were different degrees of inspiration." The advocates of this view use the difference between "illumination" and inspiration to prove their theory. Fourth, "At one time the writers were inspired in the supervision of the work they did;" at another, "In the view they took of the work they were called upon to do;" and at another, "In directing the work." But in all these views the theorists are at sea, and leave all who trust to their pilotage at sea, as to the exact character and limitations of inspiration. Fifth, "Dynamic inspiration". But the efforts of those who hold to this view, to explain what they mean by the term are exceedingly vague and misty. But the popular and current theory now is that the "Concept" is inspired. But no one attempts to tell what the "Concept" is; indeed, I doubt if any one knows.

Also let this be said in this connection: Those who hold to any or all of the above named theories, in part or in whole, are

emphatic in declaring that the Bible is not verbally inspired. The noisy ones will say, "No scholar believes in verbal inspiration." In this they bear false witness. Another expression in common use among them is this: "Such belief drives men into infidelity." And yet no one of them ever knew of a case. This class, with as much care and evident satisfaction as an infidel, hunt out the apparent contradictions and errors in the authorized and revised versions, and exultingly declare: "Here is conclusive evidence that the Bible is not verbally inspired." Some of these gentlemen are dishonest because, First, they know that most of these apparent errors and contradictions were long ago satisfactorily answered, even to the silencing of infidel scoffers; and Second, they know that no one believes that the translations and revisions are inspired. The doctrine of verbal inspiration is simply this: The original writings, *ipsissima verba*, came through the penmen direct from God; and the critics are only throwing dust into the air when they rail against verbal inspiration and attempt to disprove it by pointing out the apparent errors and discrepancies of the authorized and revised texts.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, in 1893, by a unanimous vote made the following deliverance: "The Bible as we now have it in its various translations and revisions when freed from all errors and mistakes of translators, copyists and printers, is the very Word of God, and consequently, wholly without error."

We mean by Inspiration that the words composing the Bible are God-breathed. If they are not, then the Bible is not inspired at all, since it is composed only and solely of words.

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God" (2 Tim. 3:16). The word rendered Scripture in this passage is *Graphe*. It means writing, anything written. The writing is composed of words. What else is this but verbal inspira-

tion; and they wrest the "Scriptures unto their own destruction", who teach otherwise.

Prof. A. A. Hodge says: "The line can never rationally be drawn between the thoughts and words of Scripture. . . . That we have an inspired Bible, and a verbally inspired one, we have the witness of God Himself."

Prof. Gaussen says: "The theory of a Divine Revelation, in which you would have the inspiration of thoughts, without the inspiration of the language, is so inevitably irrational that it cannot be sincere, and proves false even to those who propose it."

Canon Westcott says: "The slightest consideration will show that words are as essential to intellectual processes as they are to mutual intercourse. . . . Thoughts are wedded to words as necessarily as soul to body. Without it the mysteries unveiled before the eyes of the seer would be confused shadows; with it, they are made clear lessons for human life."

Dean Burgon, a man of vast learning, says: "You cannot dissect inspiration into substance and form. As for thoughts being inspired, apart from the words which give them expression, you might as well talk of a tune without notes, or a sum without figures. No such theory of inspiration is even intelligible. It is as illogical as it is worthless, and cannot be too sternly put down."

This doctrine of the inspiration of Scripture, in all its elements and parts, has always been the doctrine of the Church. Dr. Westcott has proved this by a copious catena of quotations from Ante-Nicene Fathers in Appendix B to his "Introduction to the Study of the Gospels". He quotes Clemens Romanus as saying that the Scriptures are "the true utterances of the Holy Ghost".

Take a few quotations from the Fathers: 1. Justin, speaking of the words of Scripture, says: "We must not suppose that the language proceeds from the men that are inspired,

but from the Divine Word Himself, who moves them. Their work is to announce that which the Holy Spirit proposes to teach, through them, to those who wish to learn the true religion. The Divine power acts on men just as a plectrum on a harp or lyre." "The history Moses wrote was by the Divine Inspiration." And so, of all the Bible.

2. Irenaeus. "The writers spoke as acted on by the Spirit. All who foretold the Coming of Christ (Moses, David, Isaiah, etc.), received their inspiration from the Son, for how else could Scripture 'testify' of Him alone?" "Matthew might have written, 'The generation of Jesus was on this wise,' but the Holy Spirit, foreseeing the corruption of the truth, and fortifying us against deception, says, through Matthew, 'The generation of Jesus the Messiah was on this wise.'" "The writers are beyond all falsehood" i. e., they are inerrant.

3. Clement of Alexandria. The foundations of our faith rest on no insecure basis. We have received them through God Himself through the Scripture, not one jot or tittle of which shall pass away till all is accomplished, for the mouth of the Lord, the Holy Spirit, spoke it. He ceases to be a man who spurns the tradition of the Church, and turns aside to human opinions; for the Scriptures are truly holy, since they make us holy, God-like. Of these Holy Writings or Words, the Bible is composed. Paul calls them God-breathed. (2 Tim. 3:15, 16.) The Sacred Writings consist of these holy letters or syllables, since they are "God-breathed". Again, "The Jews and Christians agree as to the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, but differ in interpretation. By our faith, we believe that every Scripture, since it is God-breathed, is profitable. If the words of the Lord are pure words, refined silver, tried seven times, and the Holy Spirit has, with all care, dictated them accurately, it was on this account the Saviour said that not one jot or tittle of them should pass away."

4. Origen. "It is the doctrine acknowledged by all Christians, and evidently preached in the churches, that the Holy Spirit, inspired the Saints, Prophets and Apostles, and was present in those of old time, as in those He inspired at the Coming of Christ; for Christ, the Word of God, was in Moses when he wrote, and in the Prophets, and by His Spirit He did speak to them all things. The records of the Gospels are the Oracles of the Lord, pure Oracles, purified as silver seven times tried. They are without error, since they were accurately written, by the co-operation of the Holy Spirit." "It is good to adhere to the words of Paul and the Apostles, as to God and our Lord Jesus Christ. There are many writings, but only one Book; four Evangelists, but only one Gospel. All the Sacred Writings breathe the same fullness. There is nothing, in the Law, the Prophets, the Gospel, the Apostles, that did not come from the fullness of God. Whoever has received these Scriptures as inspired by the Creator of the world, must expect to find in them all the difficulties which meet those who investigate the system of the universe. But God's hand is not destroyed by our ignorance on particular points. The divinity of the Scriptures remains undisturbed by our weakness. It is a point in the teaching of the Church, that the Scriptures were written by the Spirit of God, and on this the opinion of the whole Church is one. All things that are written are true. He who is a student of God's Oracles must place himself under the teaching of God." So much for this Father of "Biblical Criticism," mighty in the Church.

5. Augustine. The view of the Holy Scriptures held by Augustine was that held by Tertullian, Cyprian and all Fathers of the North African Church. No view of verbal inspiration could be more rigid. "The Scriptures are the letters of God, the voice of God, the writings of God." "The writers record the words of God. Christ spoke by Moses, for He was the Spirit of the Creator, and all the

prophecies are the voice of the Lord. From the Spirit came the gift of tongues. All Scripture is profitable since it is inspired of God. The Scriptures, whether in History, Prophecy, Psalms or Law, are of God. They cannot stand in part and fall in part. They are from God, who spake them all." "As it was not the Apostles who spoke, but the Spirit of the Father in them, so it is the Spirit that speaks in all Scriptures". "It avails nothing what I say, what he says, but what saith the Lord".

Prof. B. B. Warfield, of Princeton Theological Seminary, said in an article, on The Westminster Doctrine of Inspiration: "Doubtless enough has been said to show that the confession teaches precisely the doctrine which is taught in the private writings of the framers, which was also the General Protestant Doctrine of the time, and not of that time only or of the Protestants only; for despite the contrary assertion that has recently become tolerably current, essentially this doctrine of inspiration (verbal) has been the doctrine of the Church of all ages and of all names."

There is nothing truer in the world than that both the Jewish Church and the Christian Church believed the doctrine, because of their conception of the Holy Scriptures as the result of the *"Creative Breath of God,"* even as matter itself, the soul of man, and the world, were created by the same *"Breath of the Almighty"*—the very conception Paul had when he said, *"Every Scripture is God-breathed!"* The pervasive evidence of verbal inspiration stares one in the face at the opening of every page of the Bible. It is not a *"few texts"*, here and there, on which it depends, but it *"stands"* rooted in the whole body of the Word of God. He who knows what the Jews understood by the expression, "the Oracles of God", a divinely oracular Book, different from every other—a Book of God's own "Testimony"—will know that no other conception of its contents could prevail than this, that it was *"divinely inspired"*, having *"God"* as

its Author, and truth without error as its matter. The manner in which the *Old Testament* is quoted in the *New* is crowning demonstration of its verbal inspiration. That subjectless verb, *"saith"* (rendered, "It saith"), that nominative, the "Scripture saith", that personal subject, "He" ("He saith"), that identification of God with the "Scripture," ("the Scripture foreseeing," giving to it eyes, mouth and foreknowledge, as a living organism equal with God), that recognition of the human writer, as "Moses saith," "David saith," "Isaiah saith," is a divinely governed authorship; therefore it is all one to say, "Moses saith," "It saith," "the Scripture saith", "He saith", since in all it is *"God saith"*—all this proves the "high place," the estimate and conception which Christ, His Apostles, and the whole Jewish and Christian Church, had of the*"Scriptures"*, and that they are a God-breathed, oracular Book, created by the *Breath* of God—a verbally inspired Book, whose *"words"* were the "Words of God", infallible, authoritative, final, the court of last appeal, the very "Utterance" and "Voice" "of God," who *spoke* in time past in the Prophets, and who has spoken to us in these last days in His Son—"words" commanded to be *written* in the days of Moses and commanded to be *written* in the Apostles' days —the Spirit promised "to guide," to permit no lapse of "remembrance," and to "reveal" the future.

Such form of citation, quotation, reference, and allusion to the Old Testament came from the conception of the Scriptures as the verbally inspired Book of God. It was by means of this specific and customary formula of quotation, Christ and His Apostles made known to the Church their exalted estimate of the *"Volume of the Book."* On this ground alone arose all the high attributes ascribed to it—its Divine origin, sanctity, sublimity, infallibility, authority and sufficiency for mankind. This uniform emphasis of the Scriptures as the product of the*"Breath of God,"* not mere "human literature," as the critics would have it, nor a "human element" uncon-

trolled by the Divine, nor the miserable excuse of "wordless thoughts", the thoughts "inspired", but the "words not"—is characteristic of the treatment the Old Testament Scriptures everywhere receive in the New Testament. On no other view than that of verbal inspiration could such a manner of quotation, whether strict or free, have arisen. It is as the *"Creation"* and the *"Oracles"* of God they are referred to. On this their authority, holiness, perfection and perpetuity rest. And as to the "authorship" of the "Books" of Scripture, the citation of different texts existing in different "Books", render the names of different human authors, as "Moses saith", "David saith", "Isaiah saith", *is* proof that the authors of the texts are the authors of the "Books" in which they are found, and which bear their name. Only "Higher Critics" could dispute this.

SOME PROOFS OF VERBAL INSPIRATION

The Bible plainly teaches that its words are inspired, and that it *is* the Word of God. Let us examine into this matter a little, by considering briefly three kinds of evidence, viz.:

First. Direct testimony.

Second. Inferential testimony.

Third. Resultant testimony.

FIRST. Let us note the Direct Testimony of the Bible to the fact of verbal inspiration.

"And Moses said unto the Lord, I am not eloquent [a man of words], neither heretofore nor since Thou hast spoken unto Thy servant: for I am slow of speech, and of a slow tongue. And the Lord said unto him, Who hath made man's mouth? . . . . Now therefore go, and I will be with thy mouth, and teach thee what thou shalt speak" (Ex. 4: 10-12). "And the Lord said unto Moses, Write thou these words: for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee, and with Israel" (Ex. 34:27). "And He said, Hear now My words: if there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will

make myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream. . . . With him [Moses] will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches; and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold" (Num. 12:6, 8). "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish from it" (Deut. 4:2). "But the prophet which shall speak a word presumptuously in My name, which I have not commanded him to speak, . . . that prophet shall die" (Deut. 18:20).

In Mark 12:36, Jesus said: "David himself said in the Holy Spirit." If we turn to 2 Sam. 23:2, we will find what it was David said: "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and His word was upon my tongue."

Jeremiah said: "Ah! Lord God! behold I cannot speak, for I am a child. But the Lord saith unto me, Say not I am a child, for thou shalt go to all that I shall send thee, and whatsoever I command thee thou shalt speak. Be not afraid of their faces, for I am with thee to deliver thee, saith the Lord. Then the Lord put forth His hand and touched my mouth. And the Lord said unto me, Behold, I have put My words in thy mouth" (Jer. 1:6-9).

Balaam was compelled to speak against his will. He said: "Lo, I am come unto thee; have I now any power at all to say anything? the word that God putteth in my mouth, that shall I speak." He did his very utmost to curse the Israelites, but as often as he tried it, he blessed them. Balak at last said, "Neither curse them at all, nor bless them at all." But Balaam answered, "Told not I thee, saying, All the Lord speaketh, that must I do" (Num. 22:38; 23:26).

In the five books of Moses, in the books called historical, and books included under the general title of the Psalms, such expressions as the following occur hundreds of times: "Thus saith the Lord;" "The Lord said;" "The Lord spake;" "The Lord hath spoken;" "The saying of the Lord;" and "The word of the Lord." There is no other thought expressed in

these books concerning inspiration than that the writers spoke and wrote the very words that God gave them.

Turning to the books called prophetical, we find Isaiah saying, "Hear the word of the Lord" (Isa. 1:10); and no fewer than twenty times does he explicitly declare that his writings are the "words of the Lord." Almost one hundred times does Jeremiah say, "The word of the Lord came unto me," or declare he was uttering the "words of the Lord," and the "word of the living God." Ezekiel says that his writings are the "words of God" quite sixty times. Here is a sample: "Son of man, all My words that I shall speak unto thee receive in thine heart, and hear with thine ears. And go get thee to them of the captivity, unto the children of thy people, and speak unto them, and tell them, Thus saith the Lord God" (Ezek. 3:10-11). Daniel said, "And when I heard the voice of His words" (Dan. 10:9). Hosea said, "The word of the Lord" (Hosea 1:1). "The word of the Lord that came to Joel" (Joel 1:1). Amos said, "Hear the word of the Lord" (Amos 3:1). Obadiah said, "Thus saith the Lord God" (Oba. 1:1). "The word of the Lord came unto Jonah" (Jonah 1:1). "The word of the Lord that came to Micah" (Micah 1:1). Nahum said, "Thus saith the Lord" (Nah. 1:12). Habakkuk wrote, "The Lord answered me and said" (Hab. 2:2). "The word of the Lord which came to Zephaniah" (Zeph. 1:1). "Came the word of the Lord by Haggai the prophet" (Hag. 1:1). "Came the word of the Lord unto Zechariah" (Zech. 1:1). "The word of the Lord to Israel by Malachi" (Mal. 1:1). And in this last of the Old Testament books, is it twenty-four times said, "Thus saith the Lord."

The words Jesus Himself uttered were inspired. The words He spoke were not His own, but actually put into His mouth. In the most express manner it was foretold that Christ should thus speak, just as Moses spake. "A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up, *like unto me.* To Him ye shall hearken." Twice it is said, *"like unto me."* And how like to Moses, ex-

cept as the whole context shows, *"like unto"* him in *verbal inspiration?* To Moses God said: "I will be with thy mouth, and teach thee what to say. Thou shalt put words in Aaron's mouth, and I will be with thy mouth, and teach you what you shall say. And he shall be thy spokesman to the people. And he shall be to thee instead of a mouth, and thou shalt be to him instead of God" (Ex. 4:11-16). Therefore did Jesus, the Prophet, utter inspired words "like unto Moses." The very *words* He spoke God put into His mouth and on His tongue. Therefore did He say, assuring the Jews that Moses wrote of Him: "I have not spoken from Myself, but the Father who sent Me gave Me commandment what I should say and what I should speak. I speak therefore even as the Father said to Me, even so I speak" (John 12:49, 50). "I have given unto them the *words Thou gavest Me,* and they have received them" (John 17:8). "The Son can do nothing from Himself" (5:19). Since *Jesus Christ had to be divinely helped, "like unto Moses", the very words put into His mouth,* Himself *God's mouth,* and as God to the people, how should not the Evangelists and Apostles need the same Divine guidance and help to qualify them for their work, and guarantee its inerrant truthfulness and its Divine authority? If Moses and Isaiah, if Jesus Christ Himself, had to be divinely assisted, how should the narrators of New Testament history and oracles be exempted from the same Divine activity of the Spirit, all-controlling and guiding into the full truth? What are the words of Jesus to John, and to the Seven Churches of the Apocalypse, but the literal words of God dictated verbally by Jesus Christ?

Jesus said to the disciples, "And when they lead you to the judgment, and deliver you up, be not anxious beforehand what ye shall speak: but whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye: for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost" (Mark 13:11).

This same gift included all the disciples on the day of Pen-

tecost, for "They were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance" (Acts 2:1, 4). The multitude that heard "marveled, saying, Behold, are not all these which speak Galileans? And how hear we every man in our own language? . . . We do hear them speaking in our tongues the mighty works of God" (Acts 2:7, 11).

Paul says: "Which things also we speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth" (1 Cor. 2:13). "And for this cause we also thank God without ceasing, that, when ye received from us the word of the message, *even the word* of God, ye accepted it not as the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the word of God" (1 Thess. 2:13).

And so the Bible uniformly teaches the doctrine of verbal inspiration. It *is* the Word of God. This is the invariable testimony of the Book itself. It never, in a single instance, says that the thoughts of the writers were inspired; or, that these writers had a "Concept." The Scriptures are called "The oracles of God" (Rom. 3:2); "The Word of God" (Luke 8:11); "The Word of the Lord" (Acts 13:48); "The Word of life" (Phil. 2:16); "The Word of Christ" (Col. 3:16); "The Word of truth" (Eph. 1:13); "The Word of faith" (Rom. 10:8); and, by these and similar statements, do they declare, *more than two thousand times*, that the Bible is the Word of God—that the words are God-breathed, are inspired (theopneustos).

SECOND. What of the Inferential Testimony to the fact of verbal inspiration? I mean by Inferential Testimony that which is assumed by the Bible, and the natural implication belonging to many of its statements.

The Bible assumes to be from God in that it meets man face to face with drawn sword and says: "Thou shalt!" and "Thou shalt not!" and demands immediate, unconditional and irreversible surrender to the authority of heaven, and sub-

mission to all the laws and will of God, as made known in its pages. This of itself would not signify a great deal, though unique, were it not for the striking and significant results of such submission; but, the natural inference of such assumption is, that the words of demand and command are from God.

A great many statements of the Bible plainly indicate that the words are inspired. The following are a few instances: "Forever, O Lord, Thy Word is settled in heaven" (Psa. 119:89). This is characteristic of the entire Psalm. "The words of the Lord are pure words" (Psa. 12:6). "Is not My word like as a fire? saith the Lord; and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?" (Jer. 23:29). "The Word of our God shall stand forever" (Isa. 40:8); and so on, almost *ad infinitum*. Everywhere in the sacred record you find this same suggestion of Divine authorship. Jesus and the Apostles always recognized it, and gave it prominence and emphasis. Its importance and value should not be underestimated.

THIRD. The Resultant Testimony. What of it? Paul tells us that "Every sacred writing" is "God-breathed." (*Pasa Graphe Theopneustos.*) "No prophecy ever came by the will of man; but men spake from God, being moved [*pheromenoi,* borne along] by the Holy Spirit" (2 Pet. 1:21). (This passage does not justify the so-called "mechanical theory of inspiration." Such theory is nowhere taught in the Scriptures. Indeed, the obvious fact that the individual characteristics of the writers were in no way changed or destroyed, disproves such theory.) It is said: "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul" (Gen. 2:7). Elihu said, "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life" (Job 33:4). Now, then, the very same Almighty power that gave life to Adam and Elihu, and which made the "Heavens . . . and

all the host of them," is, in some mysterious sense, in the words of the Sacred Record. Therefore are we told: "For the Word of God is living and active, and sharper than any two-edged sword, and piercing even to the dividing of soul and spirit, of both joints and marrow, and quick to discern the thoughts and intents of the heart" (Heb. 4:12). What results will follow believing the Word and submission to its requirements?

1. It will impart spiritual life and save the soul. "Receive with meekness the implanted Word, which is able to save your souls" (James 1:21). "Having been begotten again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, through the Word of God, which liveth and abideth" (1 Pet. 1:23). "Of His own will begat He us by the Word of truth" (James 1:18). Jesus said: "The words I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life" (John 6:63).

As a good seed contains the germ of life, so that when cast into the soil of earth at the proper season, under the influence of sunshine and showers, it germinates and springs up to reproduce itself in kind; even so the words of the Bible, if received into the mind and heart to be believed and obeyed, germinate, and spiritual life is the result, reproducing its kind; and that believing soul is made partaker of the Divine nature. (2 Pet. 1:4.) "He is a new creature [creation]; the old things are passed away; behold, they are become new" (2 Cor. 5:17). The power and life of the Almighty lie hidden in the words of the Sacred Record; they are God-breathed; and that power and life will be manifest in the case of every one who will receive them with meekness to believe them and submit to their requirements. All the books men have written cannot do this.

2. It has cleansing power. "Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way? By taking heed thereto according to Thy Word" (Psa. 119:9). Jesus said: "Already ye are clean because of the Word which I have spoken unto you" (John

15:3). "That He might sanctify it, having cleansed it, by the washing of water with the Word" (Eph. 5:26).

3. By the Word we are kept from evil and the power of the evil one. The Psalmist said: "By the words of Thy lips I have kept me from the paths of the destroyer" (Psa. 17:4); and, "Thy Word have I hid in my heart, that I might not sin against Thee" (Psa. 119:11). Therefore, Jesus said: "I have given them Thy Word. . . . Sanctify them through [in] the truth. Thy Word is truth" (John 17:14, 17).

The voice said: "Cry. And he said, What shall I cry? All flesh is grass, and all the goodliness thereof is as the flower of the field. . . . The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the Word of our God shall stand forever" (Isa. 40:6, 8). "For we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth" (2 Cor. 13:8).

This, then, is the sum of our contention: The Bible is made up of writings, and these are composed of words. The WORDS are inspired—God-breathed. Therefore is the Bible inspired—*is* God's Word.

This is plainly seen, first, in the uniform declaration of the Book. All the Old Testament Prophets, Jesus our Lord, and all the New Testament writers, bear the same testimony concerning this transcendentally important matter. Not a single word or thought to the contrary can anywhere be found in all their declarations. The attitude of Jesus toward the Old Testament and His utterances confirm beyond question our contention. He had the very same Old Testament we have today. He believed it to be the Word of God, and proclaimed it as such. He said, "One jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the laws, till all be fulfilled." In thwarting the tempter He said: "It is written! it is written! it is written!" In confounding the Jews, He said: "If ye believed Moses ye would believe Me; for he wrote of Me." He never criticised the Scriptures, but always appealed to them as His Father's words, authoritative and final.

Jesus is the life and the light of man. The same is true of the Scriptures. Jesus said: "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." The Psalmist said, "Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path." In an inexplicable way Jesus is identified with the Word. "The Word was God. . . . and the Word became flesh." And when the victories of the Gospel shall have been finally accomplished, and Jesus shall assert His regal rights, His name is called, "The Word of God." (See Rev. 19:11, 13.)

Second. The Bible assumes to be God's Word by its imperious demands. Who but God has a right to require of men what the Bible does?

Third. The Bible has fulfilled all its claims and promises. The marvelous, far-reaching results of proclaiming and believing it, demonstrably prove its supernatural origin and character.

That there are difficulties, I well enough know. But many difficulties have disappeared as a result of patient, reverent, scholarly research; and without doubt others will soon go the same way. So, while I bid the scholars and reverent critics God-speed in their noble work, with the late learned Bishop Ryle I say: "Give me the plenary verbal theory with all its difficulties, rather than the doubt. I accept the difficulties, and humbly wait for their solution; but while I wait I am standing on a rock."

Let this, then, be our *attitude,* to tell it out to the wide world that the blessed Bible, the "Holy Scriptures" of both Testaments, are the product of the *"Breath of God,"* who made heaven and earth, and "breathed" into man His soul; the product of that Divine *"Breath"* that regenerates, that illuminates and sanctifies the soul; a *"God-breathed Scriptures",* whose "words" are the "words of God." Tell it to the Church in her seminaries, universities and colleges, from her pulpits, Sunday Schools and Bible classes, and sound it in every convention, conference and assembly that her concep-

tion and estimate of the Scriptures must be no lower and no less than were the high conception and estimate of the "Volume of the Book" by our Lord and His Apostles; that what they regarded as the *"Breath of God"*, she must so regard in opposition to every breath of man that dares to breathe otherwise. Say, with the immortal Athanasius, who knew how to read Greek better than the "drift of scholarly opinion" "in our time": "O my child, not only the ancient, but the new Scriptures are God-breathed, as Paul saith, 'Every Scripture is God-breathed' ". Say to the rising ministry, "Speak as the Oracles of God speak"—the words that "God hath spoken," the words that Christ has written. Be at least, as decent as Balaam! "Whatsoever He saith unto you, do;" and whatsoever He saith unto you, say. Tell it to every reader and hearer of the Word, that what "Moses saith" and "David saith" and "Isaiah, Peter, Paul, John and the Scripture, saith", is what *"God saith"*. Tell it to the dying saint, when his last pulse quivers at the wrist, and friends are weeping by his bed, and "Science" has exhausted in vain all her poor resources, that God, who breathed the Scriptures, "cannot lie", that Jesus is a Rock, and that the "firm Foundation" laid in the Word for his faith can never disappoint his trust. To every question of Exegesis or of Criticism, return the answer, "What saith the Scriptures"? "How readest thou?" "It is written!" And cease to deride the most sacred, age-established, and time-honored tradition the Apostolic Church has left us. With such an *attitude* as this, the days will revisit the Church, as once they were "in the beginning", and God, honored in His Word, will no longer restrain the Spirit, but open the windows of heaven, and pour upon her a blessing so great that there will not be room to receive it. God hasten the day!

CHAPTER III

THE MORAL GLORY OF JESUS CHRIST A PROOF OF INSPIRATION

BY REV. WM. G. MOOREHEAD, D. D., PRESIDENT OF XENIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, XENIA, OHIO, U. S. A.

The glories of the Lord Jesus Christ are threefold: Essential, official and moral. His essential glory is that which pertains to Him as the Son of God, the equal of the Father. His official glory is that which belongs to Him as the Mediator. It is the reward conferred on Him, the august promotion He received when He had brought His great work to a final and triumphant conclusion. His moral glory consists of the perfections which marked His earthly life and ministry; perfections which attached to every relation He sustained, and to every circumstance in which He was found. His essential and official glories were commonly veiled during His earthly sojourn. His moral glory could not be hid; He could not be less than perfect in everything; it belonged to Him; it was Himself. This moral glory now illumines every page of the four Gospels, as once it did every path He trod.

The thesis which we undertake to illustrate and establish is this: That the moral glory of Jesus Christ as set forth in the four Gospels cannot be the product of the unaided human intellect, that only the Spirit of God is competent to execute this matchless portrait of the Son of Man. The discussion of the theme falls into two parts: I. A brief survey of Christ's moral glory as exhibited in the Gospels. II. The application of the argument.

I. CHRIST'S MORAL GLORY

THE HUMANITY OF JESUS

1. The moral glory of Jesus appears in His development as Son of Man. The nature which He assumed was our na-

ture, sin and sinful propensities only excepted. His was a real and a true humanity, one which must pass through the various stages of growth like any other member of the race. From infancy to youth, from youth to manhood, there was steady increase both of His bodily powers and mental faculties; but the progress was orderly. "No unhealthy precocity marked the holiest of infancies." He was first a child, and afterwards a man, not a man in child's years.

As Son of Man He was compassed about with all the sinless infirmities that belong to our nature. He has needs common to all; need of food, of rest, of human sympathy and of divine assistance. He is subject to Joseph and Mary, He is a worshiper in the synagogue and the Temple; He weeps over the guilty and hardened city, and at the grave of a loved one; He expresses His dependence on God by prayer.

Nothing is more certain than that the Gospel narratives present the Lord Jesus as a true man, a veritable member of our race. But we no sooner recognize this truth than we are confronted by another which sets these records alone and unapproachable in the field of literature. This second fact is this: At every stage of His development, in every relation of life, in every part of His service He is absolutely perfect. To no part of His life does a mistake attach, over no part of it does a cloud rest, nowhere is there defect. Nothing is more striking, more unexampled, than the profound contrast between Jesus and the conflict and discord around Him, than between Him and those who stood nearest Him, the disciples, John Baptist, and the mother, Mary. All fall immeasurably below Him.

THE PATTERN MAN

2. The Gospels exalt our Lord infinitely above all other men as the representative, the ideal, the pattern man. Nothing in the judgment of historians stands out so sharply distinct as race, national character—nothing is more ineffaceable.

The very greatest men are unable to free themselves from the influences amid which they have been born and educated. Peculiarities of race and the spirit of the age leave in their characters traces that are imperishable. To the last fiber of his being Luther was German, Calvin was French, Knox was Scotch; Augustine bears the unmistakable impress of the Roman, and Chrysostom is as certainly Greek. Paul, with all his large heartedness and sympathies is a Jew, always a Jew. Jesus Christ is the only One who is justly entitled to be called the Catholic Man. Nothing local, transient, individualizing, national, or sectarian dwarfs the proportions of His wondrous character. "He rises above the parentage, the blood, the narrow horizon which bounded, as it seemed, His life; for He is the archetypal man in whose presence distinctions of race, intervals of ages, types of civilization and degrees of mental culture are as nothing" (Liddon). He belongs to all ages, He is related to all men, whether they shiver amid the snows of the arctic circle, or pant beneath the burning heat of the equator; for He is the Son of Man, the Son of mankind, the genuine offspring of the race.

UNSELFISHNESS AND DIGNITY

3. The Lord's moral glory appears in His unselfishness and personal dignity. The entire absence of selfishness in any form from the character of the Lord Jesus is another remarkable feature of the Gospels. He had frequent and fair opportunities of gratifying ambition had His nature been tainted with that passion. But "even Christ pleased not himself;" He "sought not his own glory;" He came not "to do his own will." His body and His soul with all the faculties and activities of each were devoted to the supreme aims of His mission. His self-sacrifice included the whole range of His human thought and affection and action; it lasted throughout His life; its highest expression was His ignominious death on the cross of Calvary.

The strange beauty of His unselfishness as it is displayed in the Gospel narratives appears in this, that it never seeks to draw attention to itself, it deprecates publicity. In His humility He seems as one naturally contented with obscurity; as wanting the restless desire for eminence which is common to really great men; as eager and careful that even His miracles should not add to His reputation. But amid all His self-sacrificing humility He never loses His personal dignity nor the self-respect that becomes Him. He receives ministry from the lowly and the lofty; He is sometimes hungry, yet feeds the multitudes in desert places; He has no money, yet He never begs, and He provides the coin for tribute to the government from a fish's mouth. He may ask for a cup of water at the well, but it is that He may save a soul. He never flies from enemies; He quietly withdraws or passes by unseen. Hostility neither excites nor exasperates Him. He is always calm, serene. He seems to care little for Himself, for His own ease or comfort or safety, but everything for the honor and the glory of the Father. If multitudes, eager and expectant, press upon Him, shouting, "Hosanna to the son of David," He is not elated; if all fall away, stunned by His words of power, He is not cast down. He sought not a place among men, He was calmly content to be the Lord's Servant, the obedient and the humble One. It was invariably true of Him that "He pleased not Himself."

And yet through all His amazing self-renunciation, there glances ever and anon something of the infinite majesty and supreme dignity which belong to Him because He is the Son of God. The words of Van Oosterzee are as true as they are beautiful and significant: "It is the same King's Son who today dwells in the palace of His Father, and tomorrow, out of love to His rebellious subjects in a remote corner of the Kingdom, renouncing His princely glory, comes to dwell amongst them in the form of a servant * * * and is known only by the dignity of His look, and the star of royalty

on His breast, when the mean cloak is opened for a moment, apparently by accident."

SUPERIORITY TO HUMAN JUDGMENT AND INTERCESSION

4. The Gospels exhibit the Lord Jesus as superior to the judgment and the intercession of men. When challenged by the disciples and by enemies, as He often was, Jesus never apologizes, never excuses Himself, never confesses to a mistake. When the disciples, terrified by the storm on the lake, awoke Him saying, "Master, carest thou not that we perish?", He did not vindicate His sleep, nor defend His apparent indifference to their fears. Martha and Mary, each in turn, with profound grief, say, "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died." There is not a minister of the gospel the world over who would not in similar circumstances explain or try to explain why he could not at once repair to the house of mourning when summoned thither. But Jesus does not excuse His not being there, nor His delay of two days in the place where He was when the urgent message of the sisters reached Him. In the consciousness of the perfect rectitude of His ways, He only replies, "Thy brother shall rise again." Peter once tried to admonish Him, saying, "This be far from thee, Lord; this shall not be unto thee." But Peter had to learn that it was Satan that prompted the admonition. Nor does He recall a word when the Jews rightly inferred from His language that He "being man made Himself God" (John 10:30-36). He pointed out the application of the name Elohim (God) to judges under the theocracy; and yet He irresistibly implies that His title to Divinity is higher than, and distinct in kind from, that of the Jewish magistrates. He thus arrives a second time at the assertion which had given so great offense, by announcing His identity with the Father, which involves His own proper Deity. The Jews understood Him. He did not retract what they accounted blasphemy, and they again sought His life. He is never mistaken, and never retracts.

So likewise He is superior to human intercession. He never asks even His disciples nor His nearest friends, and certainly never His mother Mary, to pray for Him. In Gethsemane He asked the three to watch with Him, He did not ask them to pray for Him. He bade them pray that they might not enter into temptation, but He did not ask them to pray that He should not, nor that He should be delivered out of it. Paul wrote again and again, "Brethren, pray for us"—"pray for me." But such was not the language of Jesus. It is worthy of note that the Lord does not place His own people on a level with Himself in His prayers. He maintains the distance of His own personal dignity and supremacy between Himself and them. In His intercession He never uses plural personal pronouns in His petitions. He always says, "I" and "me," "these" and "them that thou hast given me;" never "we" and "us," as we speak and should speak in our prayers.

THE SINLESSNESS OF JESUS

5. The sinlessness of the Saviour witnesses to His moral glory. The Gospels present us with one solitary and unique fact of human history—an absolutely sinless Man! In His birth immaculate, in His childhood, youth and manhood, in public and private, in death and in life, He was faultless. Hear some witnesses. There is the testimony of His enemies. For three long years the Pharisees were watching their victim. As another writes, "There was the Pharisee mingling in every crowd, hiding behind every tree. They examined His disciples, they cross-questioned all around Him. They looked into His ministerial life, into His domestic privacy, into His hours of retirement. They came forward with the sole accusation they could muster—that He had shown disrespect to Caesar. The Roman judge who ought to know, pronounced it void." There was another spy—Judas. Had there been one failure in the Redeemer's career, in his awful agony Judas would have remembered it for his comfort; but the bitterness of his de-

spair, that which made his life intolerable, was, "I have betrayed the innocent blood."

There is the testimony of His friends. His disciples affirm that during their intercourse with Him His life was unsullied. Had there been a single blemish they would have detected it, and, honest historians as they were, they would have recorded it, just as they did their own shortcomings and blunders. The purest and most austere man that lived in that day, John the Baptist, shrank from baptizing the Holy One, and in conscious unworthiness he said, "I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?" Nor is His own testimony to be overlooked. Jesus never once confesses sin. He never once asks for pardon. Yet is it not He who so sharply rebukes the self-righteousness of the Pharisees? Does He not, in His teaching, seem to ignore all human piety that is not based upon a broken heart? But yet He never lets fall a hint, He never breathes a prayer which implies the slightest trace of blameworthiness. He paints the doom of incorrigible and unrepentent sinners in the most dreadful colors found in the entire Bible, but He Himself feels no apprehension, He expresses no dread of the penal future; His peace of mind, His fellowship with Almighty God, is never disturbed nor interrupted. If He urge sorrow upon others and tears of penitence, it is for their sins; if He groan in agony, it is not for sins of His own, it is for others'. He challenges His bitterest enemies to convict Him of Sin (John 8:46). Nor is this all. "The soul," it has been said, "like the body has its pores," and the pores are always open. "Instinctively, unconsciously, and whether a man will or not, the insignificance or the greatness of the inner life always reveals itself." From its very center and essence the moral nature is ever throwing out about itself circles of influence, encompasses itself with an atmosphere of self-disclosure. In Jesus Christ this self-revelation was not involuntary, nor accidental, nor forced: it was in the highest degree deliberate. There is about Him an air of

superior holiness, of aloofness from the world and its ways, a separation from evil in every form and of every grade, such as no other that has ever lived has displayed. Although descended from an impure ancestry, He brought no taint of sin into the world with Him; and though He mingled with sinful men and was assailed by fierce temptations, He contracted no guilt, He was touched by no stain. He was not merely undefiled, but He was undefilable. He was like a ray of light which parting from the fountain of light can pass through the foulest medium and still be unstained and untouched. He came down into all the circumstances of actual humanity in its sin and misery, and yet He kept the infinite purity of heaven with Him. In the annals of our race there is none next to or like Him.

ASSEMBLAGE AND CORRELATION OF VIRTUES

6. The exquisite assemblage and correlation of virtues and excellencies in the Lord Jesus form another remarkable feature of the Gospel narratives. There have been those who have displayed distinguished traits of character; those who by reason of extraordinary gifts have risen to heights which are inaccessible to the great mass of men. But who among the mightiest of men has shown himself to be evenly balanced and rightly poised in all his faculties and powers? In the very greatest and best, inequality and disproportion are encountered. Generally, the failings and vices of men are in the inverse ratio of their virtues and their powers. "The tallest bodies cast the longest shadows." In Jesus Christ there is no unevenness. In Him there is no preponderance of the imagintion over the feeling, of the intellect over the imagination, of the will over the intellect. There is in Him an uninterrupted harmony of all the powers of body and soul, in which that serves which should serve, and that rules which ought to rule, and all works together to one adorable end. In Him every grace is in its perfectness, none in excess, none out of place, and none wanting. His justice and His mercy, His

peerless love and His truth, His holiness and His freest pardon never clash; one never clouds the other. His firmness never degenerates into obstinacy, or His calmness into indifference. His gentleness never becomes weakness, nor His elevation of soul forgetfulness of others. In His best servants virtues and graces are uneven and often clash. Paul had hours of weakness and even of petulance. He seems to have regretted that he called himself a Pharisee in the Jewish Sanhedrin and appealed to that party for help, for in his address before the proconsul Felix he said, "Or let these same here say, if they found any evil doing in me, while I stood before the Council, except it be for this one voice, that I cried standing among them, Touching the resurrection of the dead I am called in question by you this day." John the Apostle of love even wished to call down fire from heaven to consume the inhospitable Samaritans. And the Virgin mother must learn that even she cannot dictate to Him as to what He shall do or not do. In Jesus there is the most perfect balance, the most amazing equipoise of every faculty and grace and duty and power. In His whole life one day's walk never contradicts another, one hour's service never clashes with another. While He shows He is master of nature's tremendous forces, and the Lord of the unseen world, He turns aside and lays His glory by to take little children in His arms and to bless them. While He must walk amid the snares His foes have privily spread for His feet, He is equal to every occasion, is in harmony with the requirements of every moment. "He never speaks where it would be better to keep silence, He never keeps silence where it would be better to speak; and He always leaves the arena of controversy a victor." His unaffected majesty, so wonderfully depicted in the Gospels, runs through His whole life, and is as manifest in the midst of poverty and scorn, at Gethsemane and Calvary, as on the Mount of Transfiguration and in the resurrection from the grave.

OMNIPOTENCE AND OMNISCIENCE

7. The evangelists do not shrink from ascribing to the Lord Jesus divine attributes, particularly Omnipotence and Omniscience. They do so as a mere matter of fact, as what might and should be expected from so exalted a personage as the Lord Jesus was. How amazing the power is which He wields when it pleases Him to do so! It extends to the forces of nature. At His word the storm is hushed into a calm, and the raging of the sea ceases. At His pleasure He walks on the water as on dry land. It extends to the world of evil spirits. At His presence demons cry out in fear and quit their hold on their victims. His power extends into the realm of disease. Every form of sickness departs at His command, and He cures the sick both when He is beside them and at a distance from them. Death likewise, that inexorable tyrant that wealth has never bribed, nor tears softened, nor human power arrested, yielded instantly his prey when the voice of the Son of God bade him.

But Jesus equally as certainly and as fully possessed a superhuman range of knowledge as well as a superhuman power. He knew men; knew them as God knows them. Thus He saw into the depths of Nathaniel's heart when he was under the fig tree; He saw into the depths of the sea, and the exact coin in the mouth of a particular fish; He read the whole past life of the woman at the well, although He had never before met with her. John tells us that "He needed not that any should testify of man: for he knew what was in man" (John ii:25). He knew the world of evil spirits. He was perfectly acquainted with the movements of Satan and of demons. He said to Peter, "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan asked to have you that he might sift you as wheat: I made supplication for thee that thy faith fail not" (Luke xxii: 31,32). He often spoke directly to the evil spirits that had control of people, ordering them to hold their peace, to come

out and to enter no more into their victims. He knew the Father as no mere creature could possibly know Him. "All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him" (Matt. xi:27).

A difficulty will be felt when we attempt to reconcile this infinite knowledge of men, of the unseen world, and of God Himself, which the Son of God possessed, with the statement in Mark that He did not know the day nor the hour of His Second Advent. But the difficulty is no greater than that other in John, where we are told that His face was wet with human tears while the almighty voice was crying, "Lazarus, come forth." In both cases the divine and the human are seen intermingling, and yet they are perfectly distinct.

Such are some of the beams of Christ's moral glories as they shine everywhere on the pages of the Four Gospels. A very few of them are here gathered together. Nevertheless, what a stupendous picture do they form! In the annals of our race there is nothing like it. Here is One presented to us who is a true and genuine man, and yet He is the ideal, the representative, the pattern man, claiming kindred in the catholicity of His manhood with all men; sinless, yet full of tenderness and pity; higher than the highest, yet stooping to the lowest and to the most needy; perfect in all His words and ways, in His life and in His death!

Who taught the evangelists to draw this matchless portrait? The pen which traced these glories of Jesus—could it have been other than an inspired pen? This question leads us to the second part of our task, which can soon be disposed of.

II. THE APPLICATION OF THE ARGUMENT

Nothing is more obvious than the very commonplace axiom, that every effect requires an adequate cause. Given a

piece of machinery, complex, delicate, exact in all its movements, we know that it must be the product of a competent mechanic. Given a work of consummate art, we know it must be the product of a consummate artist. None but a sculptor with the genius of an Angelo could carve the "Moses." None but a painter with the hand, the eye, and the brain of a Raphael could paint the "Transfiguration." None but a poet with the gifts of a Milton could write "Paradise Lost."

Here are four brief records of our Lord's earthly life. They deal almost exclusively with His public ministry; they do not profess even to relate all that He did in His official work (cf. John xxi:25). The authors of these memorials were men whose names are as household words the world over; but beyond their names we know little more. The first was tax collector under the Roman government; the second was, it is generally believed, that John Mark who for a time served as an attendant on Paul and Barnabas, and who afterward became the companion and fellow-laborer of Peter; the third was a physician and the devoted friend and coworker of Paul; and the fourth was a fisherman. Two of them, Matthew and John, were disciples of Jesus; whether the others, Mark and Luke, ever saw Him during His earthly sojourn cannot be determined.

These four men, unpracticed in the art of writing, unacquainted with the ideals of antiquity, write the memorials of Jesus' life. Three of them traverse substantially the same ground, record the same incidents, discourses and miracles. While they are penetrated with the profoundest admiration for their Master, they never once dilate on His great qualities. All that they do is to record His actions and His discourses with scarcely a remark. One of them indeed, John, intermingles reflective commentary with the narrative; but in doing this John carefully abstains from eulogy and panegyric. He pauses in His narrative only to explain some reference, to open some deep saying of the Lord, or to press some vital

truth. Yet, despite this absence of the smallest attempt to delineate a character, these four men have accomplished what no others have done or can do—they have presented the world with the portrait of a Divine Man, a Glorious Saviour. Matthew describes Him as the promised Messiah, the glory of Israel, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham; the One in whom the covenants and the promises find their ample fulfilment; the One who accomplishes all righteousness. Mark exhibits Him as the mighty Servant of Jehovah who does man's neglected duty, and meets the need of all around. Luke depicts Him as the Friend of man, whose love is so intense and comprehensive, whose pity is so divine, that His saving power goes forth to Jew and Gentile, to the lowliest and the loftiest, to the publican, the Samaritan, the ragged prodigal, the harlot, the thief, as well as to the cultivated, the moral, the great. John presents Him as the Son of God, the Word made flesh; as Light for a dark world, as Bread for a starving world, as Life for a dead world. Matthew writes for the Jew, Mark for the Roman, Luke for the Greek, and John for the Christian; and all of them write for every kindred, and tribe, and tongue and people of the entire globe, and for all time! What the philosopher, the poet, the scholar, the artist could not do; what men of the greatest mind, the most stupendous genius have failed to do, these four unpracticed men have done—they have presented to the world the Son of Man and the Son of God in all His perfections and glories.

A FACT TO BE EXPLAINED

How comes it to pass that these unlearned and ignorant men (Acts iv:13) have so thoroughly accomplished so great a task? Let us hold fast our commonplace axiom, every effect must have an adequate cause. What explanation shall we give of this marvellous effect? Shall we ascribe their work to genius? But multitudes of men both before and since their day have possessed genius of the very highest order;

and these gifted men have labored in fields akin to this of our four evangelists. The mightiest minds of the race—men of Chaldea, of Egypt, of India, of China, and of Greece—have tried to draw a perfect character, have expended all their might to paint a god-like man. And with what result? Either he is invested with the passions and the brutalities of fallen men, or he is a pitiless and impassive spectator of the world's sorrows and woes. In either case, the character is one which may command the fear but not the love and confidence of men.

Again, we ask, How did the evangelists solve this mighty problem of humanity with such perfect originality and precision? Only two answers are rationally possible: 1. They had before them the personal and historical Christ. Men could no more invent the God-man of the Gospels than they could create a world. The almost irreverent words of Theodore Parker are grounded in absolute truth: "It would have taken a Jesus to forge a Jesus." 2. They wrote by inspiration of the Spirit of God. It cannot be otherwise. It is not enough to say that the Divine Model was before them: they must have had something more, else they never could have succeeded.

Let it be assumed that these four men, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, were personally attendant on the ministry of Jesus—that they saw Him, heard Him, companied with Him for three years. Yet on their own showing they did not understand Him. They testify that the disciples, the Apostles among the number, got but the slenderest conceptions of His person and His mission from His very explicit teachings. They tell us of a wonderful incapacity and weakness in all their apprehensions of Him. The Sun of righteousness was shining on them and around them, and they could see only the less! He told them repeatedly of His approaching death, and of His resurrection, but they did not understand Him; they even questioned among themselves what the rising from the dead should mean (Mark ix:10)—poor men! And yet

these men, once so blind and ignorant, write four little pieces about the person and the work of the Lord Jesus which the study and the research of Christendom for eighteen hundred years have not exhausted, and which the keenest and most hostile criticism has utterly failed to discredit.

But this is not all. Others have tried their hand at composing the Life and Deeds of Jesus. Compare some of these with our Four Gospels.

SPURIOUS GOSPELS

The Gospel narrative observes an almost unbroken silence as to the long abode of Jesus at Nazareth. Of the void thus left the church became early impatient. During the first four centuries many attempts were made to fill it up. Some of these apocryphal gospels are still extant, notably that which deals with the infancy and youth of the Redeemer; and it is instructive to notice how those succeeded who tried to lift the veil which covers the earlier years of Christ. Let another state the contrast between the New Testament records and the spurious gospels: "The case stands thus: our Gospels present us with a glorious picture of a mighty Saviour, the mythic gospels with that of a contemptible one. In our Gospels He exhibits a superhuman wisdom; in the mythic ones a nearly equal superhuman absurdity. In our Gospels He is arrayed in all the beauty of holiness; in the mythic ones this aspect of character is entirely wanting. In our Gospels not one stain of sinfulness defiles His character; in the mythic ones the Boy Jesus is both pettish and malicious. Our Gospels exhibit to us a sublime morality; not one ray of it shines in those of the mythologists. The miracles of the one and of the other stand contrasted on every point." (Row.)

These spurious gospels were written by men who lived not long after the apostolic age; by Christians who wished to honor the Saviour in all they said about Him; by men who had the portraiture of Him before them which the Gospels

supply. And yet these men, many of them better taught than the Apostles, with the advantage of two or three centuries of Christian thought and study, could not produce a fancy sketch of the Child Jesus without violating our sense of propriety, and shocking our moral sense. The distance between the Gospels of the New Testament and the pseudo-gospels is measured by the distance between the product of the Spirit of God, and that of the fallen human mind.

UNINSPIRED "LIVES OF CHRIST"

Let us take another illustration. The nineteenth century has been very fruitful in the production of what are commonly called "Lives of Christ." Contrast with the Gospels four such "Lives," perhaps the completest and the best, taken altogether, of those written by English-speaking people—Andrews', Geikie's, Hanna's and Edersheim's. The authors of our Gospels had no models on which to frame their work. The path they trod had never before been pressed by human feet. The authors of the "Lives" have not only these incomparable narratives as their pattern and the chief source of all their material, but numberless other such "Lives" suggestive as to form and construction, and the culture and the research of eighteen centuries lying behind them. But would any one venture for a moment to set forth these "Lives" as rivals of our Gospels? Much information and helpfulness are to be derived from the labors of these Christian scholars, and others who have toiled in the same field; but how far they all fall below the New Testament record it is needless to show. Indeed, all such writings are largely antiquated and scarcely read, though they are quite young in years, so soon does man's work decay and die.

Let the contrast be noted as to size or bulk. Andrews' book contains 615 pages; Geikie's over 1,200; Hanna's over 2,100; Edersheim's, 1,500 pages. The four combined have no less than 5,490 pages, enough in these busy days to require

months of reading to go but once through their contents. Bagster prints the Four Gospels in 82 pages; the Oxford, in 104; Amer. Rev., 120. In the Bagster, Matthew has but 23; Mark, 13; Luke, 25; and John, 21. Less than one hundred pages of the Four Gospels against more than five thousand four hundred of the four "Lives."

Countless volumes, great and small, in the form of commentary, exposition, notes, harmony and history are written on these brief records. How happens it that such stores of wisdom and knowledge lie garnered in these short pieces? Who taught the evangelists this superhuman power of expansion and contraction, of combination and separation, of revelation in the words and more revelation below the words? Who taught them so to describe the person and work of the Lord Jesus as that the description satisfies the most illiterate and the most learned, is adapted to minds of the most limited capacity, and to those of the widest grasp? Whence did they derive the infinite skill they display in grouping together events, discourses, and actions in such fashion that vividly before us is the deathless beauty of a perfect Life? There is but one answer to these questions, there can be no other. The Spirit of the living God filled their minds with His unerring wisdom and controlled their human speech. To that creative Spirit who has peopled the world with living organisms so minute that only the microscope can reveal their presence, it is not hard to give us in so brief a compass the sublime portrait of the Son of Man. To men it is impossible.

INSPIRATION EXTENDS THROUGHOUT THE BIBLE

Now if it be conceded that the Four Gospels are inspired, we are compelled by every rule of right reason to concede the inspiration of the rest of the New Testament. For all the later communications contained in the Acts, the Epistles, and the Revelation, are already in germ form in the Gospels, just as the Pentateuch holds in germ the rest of the Old Testament.

If the Holy Spirit is the author of the Four Gospels He is none the less the author of the entire New Testament. If He creates the germ, it is He also that must unfold it into mature fruit. If He makes the seed He must likewise give the increase. To this fundamental truth the writers of the later communications bear the most explicit testimony. Paul, John, James, Peter and Jude severally intimate that what they have to impart is from Christ by His Spirit.

Furthermore, if we admit the inspiration of the New Testament we must also admit that of the Old. For, if any one thing has been established by the devout and profound study and research of evangelical scholarship it is this, that the Scriptures of the Old Testament hold in germ the revelation contained in the New. The Latin Father spoke as profoundly as truly when he said, "The New Testament lies hid in the Old, and the Old stands revealed in the New." Ancient Judaism had one supreme voice for the chosen people, and its voice was prophetic. Its voice was the significant word, *Wait.* As if it kept reminding Israel that the Mosaic Institutions were only temporary and typical, that something infinitely better and holier was to take their place; and so it said, Wait. Wait, and the true Priest will come, the Priest greater than Aaron, greater than Melchizedek—the Priest of whom these were but thin shadows, dim pictures. Wait, and the true Prophet, like unto Moses, greater than Moses, will appear. Wait, and the real sacrifice, that of which all other offerings were but feeble images, will be made and sin be put away. If any man deny the inspiration of the Old Testament, sooner or later he will deny that of the New. For the two are inseparably bound up together. If the one fall, so will the other. Already the disastrous consequences of such a course of procedure are apparent in Christendom. For years the conflict has raged about the trustworthiness, the integrity and the authority of the Old Testament. Not long since one who is identified with the attacking party arrayed against that Scrip-

ture announced that the victory is won, and nothing now remains save to determine the amount of the indemnity. It is very noteworthy that the struggle has indeed measurably subsided as to the Old Testament, although there are no signs of weakening faith in it on the part of God's faithful children, and the fight now turns with increasing vigor on the New Testament, and pre-eminently about the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ. Men who are Christians at least in name, who occupy influential seats in great Universities and even Theological Schools, do not shrink from impeaching the New Testament record touching the Virgin Birth of the Lord Jesus, His resurrection from the dead, and His promise of one day returning to this earth in majesty and power. One cannot renounce the Scriptures of the Old Testament without relaxing his hold, sooner or later, on the New.

Christ is the center of all Scripture, as He is the center of all God's purposes and counsels. The four evangelists take up the life and the moral glory of the Son of Man, and they place it alongside of the picture of the Messiah as sketched by the prophets, the historical by the side of the prophetic, and they show how exactly the two match. So long as the Four Gospels remain unmutilated and trusted by the people of God, so long is the doctrine of the Bible's supreme authority assured.

God spoke to the fathers in the prophets: He now speaks to us in His Son whom He hath made Heir of all things. In either case, whether by the prophets or by the Son, the Speaker is God.

CHAPTER IV

THE TESTIMONY OF THE SCRIPTURES TO THEMSELVES

BY REV. GEORGE S. BISHOP, D. D.,
EAST ORANGE, NEW JERSEY

My subject is, The Testimony of the Scriptures to Themselves—their own self-evidence—the overpowering, unparticipated witness that they bring.

Permit me to expand this witness under the following heads:

1. *Immortality.*
2. *Authority.*
3. *Transcendent Doctrine.*
4. *Direct Assertion.*

1. IMMORTALITY—"I have written!" All other books die. Few old books survive, and fewer of those that survive have any influence. Most of the books we quote from have been written within the last three or even one hundred years.

But here is a Book whose antemundane voices had grown old, when voices spake in Eden. A Book which has survived not only with continued but increasing lustre, vitality, vivacity, popularity, rebound of influence. A Book which comes through all the shocks without a wrench, and all the furnaces of all the ages—like an iron safe—with every document in every pigeon-hole, without a warp upon it, or the smell of fire. Here is a Book of which it may be said, as of Immortal Christ Himself: "Thou hast the dew on Thy youth from the womb of the morning." A Book dating from days as ancient as those of the Ancient of Days, and which when all that makes up what we see and call the universe shall be dissolved, will still speak on in thunder-tones of majesty, and

whisper-tones of light, and music-tones of love, for it is wrapping in itself the everlasting past, and opening and expanding from itself the everlasting future; and, like an all-irradiating sun, will still roll on, while deathless ages roll, the one unchanging, unchangeable Revelation of God.

2. Immortality is on these pages, and AUTHORITY SETS HERE HER SEAL. This is the second point. A Standard.

Useless to talk about *no* standard. Nature points to one. Conscience cries out for one—conscience which, without a law, constantly wages the internal and excruciating war of accusing or else excusing itself.

There must be a Standard and an Inspired Standard—for *Inspiration is the Essence of Authority,* and authority is in proportion to inspiration—the more inspired the greater the authority—the less, the less. Even the rationalist Rothe, a most intense opponent, has admitted that "*that* in the Bible which is not the product of direct inspiration has no binding power."

Verbal and direct inspiration is, therefore, the "Thermopylae" of Biblical and Scriptural faith. No breath, no syllable; no syllable, no word; no word, no Book; no Book, no religion.

We hold, from first to last, that there can be no possible advance in Revelation—no new light. What was written at first, the same thing stands written today, and will stand forever. The emanation of the mind of God—it is complete, perfect. "Nothing can be put to it, nor anything taken from it"; its *ipse dixit* is peremptory, final. "If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this Book; and if any man shall *take away from the words* of the Book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the Book of life, and out of the Holy City, and from the things which are written in this Book."

The Bible is the Word of God, and not simply CONTAINS IT. This is clear.

Because the Bible styles itself the Word of God. "The *Word of the Lord* is right," says the Psalmist. Again, *"Thy Word* is a lamp to my feet." "Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way? By taking heed thereto according to *Thy Word.*" "The grass withereth," says Isaiah, "the flower thereof fadeth, but *the Word of our God* shall stand forever."

Not only is the Bible called the Word of God, but it is distinguished from all other books by that very title. It is so distinguished in the 119th Psalm, and everywhere the contrast between it and every human book is deepened and sustained.

If we will not call the Bible the Word of God, then we cannot call it anything else. If we insist upon a description rigorously exact and unexposed to shafts of wanton criticism, then the Book remains anonymous. We cannot more consistently say, "Holy Scripture," because the crimes recorded on its pages are not holy; because expressions like "Curse God and die," and others from the lips of Satan and of wicked men, are unholy. The Bible, however, is "holy" because its aim and its methods are holy. The Bible, likewise, is the Word of God, because it comes from God; because its every word was penned by God; because it is the only exponent of God; the only rule of His procedure, and the Book by which we must at last be judged.

(1) The Bible is authority because in it, from cover to cover, *God is the Speaker.* Said a leader of our so-called orthodoxy to a crowded audience but a little while ago: "The Bible is true. Any man not a fool must believe what is true. What difference does it make who wrote it?" This difference, brethren; the *solemn bearing down of God on the soul!* My friend may tell me what is true; my wife may tell me what is true; but what they say is not solemn. Solemnity comes in when God looks into my face—God! and behind Him everlasting destiny—and talks with me about my soul. In the Bible God speaks, and God is listened to, and men are

born again by God's Word. "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." It is God's Revelation that faith hears, and it is *on God revealed* that faith rests.

(2) The Bible is the Word of God. It comes to us *announced by miracles and heralded with fire.* Take the Old Testament—Mount Sinai; take the New Testament—Pentecost. Would God Himself stretch out His hand and write on tables in the giving, and send down tongues of fire for the proclamation of a Revelation, every particle and shred of which was not His own? In other words, would He work miracles and send down tongues of fire to signalize a work merely human, or even partly human and partly Divine? How unworthy of God, how impious, how utterly impossible the supposition!

(3) The Bible comes clothed with authority in the *high-handed and exalted terms of its address.* God in the Bible speaks out of a whirlwind and with the voice of Elias. What grander proof of literal inspiration can be than in the high-handed method and imperative tone of prophets and apostles which enabled them—poor men, obscure, and without an influence; fishermen, artisans, publicans, day-laborers—to brave and boldly teach the world from Pharaoh and from Nero down? Was this due to anything less than God speaking in them—to the overpowering impulse and seizure of God? Who can believe it? Who is not struck with the power and the wisdom of God? "His words were in my bones," cries one. "I could not stay. The lion hath roared, who will not fear; the Lord hath spoken, who can but prophesy?"

(4) The Bible is the optime of authority, because it is from first to last *a glorious projection on the widest scale of the decrees of God.* The sweep of the Bible is from the creation of angels to a new heaven and new earth, across a lake of fire. What a field for events! What an expanse

beyond the sweep or even reach of human fore-thought, criticism, or co-operation! What a labyrinth upon whose least and minutest turning hangs entire redemption, since a chain is never stronger than its smallest link! Who then will dare to speak till God has spoken? "I will declare the decree!" That pushes everything aside—that makes the declaration an extension, so to say, of the Declarer. "I will declare the decree!" When we consider that the Bible is an exact projection of the decrees of God into the future, this argument is seen to lift, indeed, to a climax; and, in fact, it does reach to the very crux of controversy; for the hardest thing for us to believe about God is to believe that He exactly, absolutely knows, because He has ordained, the future. Every attribute of God is easier to grasp than that of an infallible Omniscience. "I will declare the decree," therefore, calls for direct inspiration.

(5) The Bible is the optime of authority, because *the hooks at the end of the chain prove the dictated inspiration of its every link.* Compare the fall in Genesis—one link—with the resurrection in the Apocalypse—the other. Compare the old creation in the first chapters of the Old Testament with the new creation in the last chapters of the New. "We open the first pages of the Bible," says Vallotton, "and we find there the recital of the creation of the world by the Word of God—of the fall of man, of his exile far from God, far from Paradise, and far from the tree of life. We open the last pages of the last of the 66 books dating 4,000 years later. God is still speaking. He is still creating. He creates a new heaven and a new earth. Man is found there recovered. He is restored to communion with God. He dwells again in Paradise, beneath the shadow of the tree of life. Who is not struck by the strange correspondence of this end with that beginning? Is not the one the prologue, the other the epilogue of a drama as vast as unique?"

(6) Another argument for the supreme authority of Scripture is the *character of the investigation challenged* for the Word of God. The Bible courts the closest scrutiny. Its open pages blaze the legend, "Search the Scriptures!" *Ereunao*—"Search." It is a sportsman's term, and borrowed from the chase. "Trace out," "track out"—follow the word in all its usages and windings. Scent it out to its remotest meanings, as a dog the hare. "They searched," again says St. Luke, in the Acts, of the Bereans. There it is another word, *anakrino*—"they divided up," analyzed, sifted, pulverized, as in a mortar—to the last thought.

What a solemn challenge is this! What book but a Divine Book would dare speak such a challenge? If a book has been written by man, it is at the mercy of men. Men can go through it, riddle it, sift it, and leave it behind them, worn out. But the Bible, a Book dropped from heaven, is "God-breathed." It swells, it dilates, with the bodying fullness of God. God has written it, and none can exhaust it. Apply your microscopes, apply your telescopes, to the material of Scripture. They separate, but do not fray, its threads. They broaden out its nebulae, but find them clustered stars. They do not reach the hint of poverty in Scripture. They nowhere touch on coarseness in the fabric, nor on limitations in horizon, as always is the case when tests of such a character are brought to bear on any work of man's. You put a drop of water, or a fly's wing, under a microscope. The stronger the lens, the more that drop of water will expand, till it becomes an ocean filled with sporting animalcules. The higher the power, the more exquisite, the more silken, become the tissues of the fly's wing, until it attenuates almost to the golden and gossamer threads of a seraph's. So is it with the Word of God. The more scrutiny, the more divinity; the more dissection, the more perfection. We cannot bring to it a test too penetrating, nor a light too lancinating, nor a touchstone too exacting.

The Bible is beyond all attempts at not only exhaustion, but comprehension. No human mind can, by searching, find out the fullness of God. "For what man knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man save the Spirit of God."

3. That leads up to the third point. The Scriptures testify to their Divine Original by their TRANSCENDENT DOCTRINE, THEIR OUTSHINING LIGHT, THEIR NATIVE RADIANCE, THE GLOW OF THE DIVINE, THE WITNESS OF THE SPIRIT.

We should expect to find a Book, that came from God, penciled with points of jasper and of sardine stone—enhaloed with a brightness from the everlasting hills. We should look for that about the Book which, flashing conviction at once, should *carry* overwhelmingly and everywhere by its bare, naked witness—by what it simply is. That, just as God, by stretching out a hand to write upon the "plaister" of a Babylonian palace, stamped, through mysterious and disjointed words, conviction of Divinity upon Belshazzar, and each one of his one thousand "lords"; so, after that same analogue—why not?—God should stretch out His hand along the unrolling palimpsests of all the ages, and write upon them *larger* words, which, to the secret recognition of each human soul, should say, not only, "This is Truth," but "This is Truth, God-spoken!"

The Bible is the Word of God, because it is the *Book of Infinites*—the revelation of what nature, without it, never could have attained, and, coming short of the knowledge of which, nature were lost.

The greatest need of the soul is salvation. It is such a knowledge of God as shall assure us of "comfort" here and hereafter. Such a knowledge, nature outside of the Bible does not contain. Everywhere groping in his darkness, man is confronted by two changeless facts. One, his guilt, which, as he looks down, sinks deeper and deeper. The other, the

justice of God, which as he looks up, lifts higher and higher. Infinite against infinite—infinite here, Infinite there—no bridge between them! Nature helps to no bridge. It nowhere speaks of atonement.

Standing with Uriel in the sun, we launch the proposition that the Scriptures are Divine in their very message because they deal with *three Infinites: Infinite Guilt; Infinite Holiness; Infinite Atonement.*

A book must itself be infinite which deals with infinites; and a book must be Divine which divinely reconciles infinites.

Infinite Guilt! Has my guilt any bottom? Is Hell any deeper? Is there, in introspection, a possible lower, more bottomless nadir? Infinite guilt! That is what opens, caves away under my feet, the longer, the more carefully I plumb my own heart—my nature, my record. Infinitely guilty! That is what I am—far, Oh, how far, below the plane of self-apology, or ghastly "criticism" of the Book which testifies to this. Infinitely guilty! That is what I am. Infinitely sinking, and, below me an infinite Tophet. I know that. As soon as the Bible declares it, I know it, and with it I know that witnessing Bible Divine. I know it—I do not know how—by an instinct, by conscience, by illumination, by the power of the Spirit of God, by the Word without, and by the flashed conviction in me which accord.

And, counterpoised above me, a correlative *Infinite—God!* What can be higher? What zenith loftier? What doming of responsibility more dread or more portentous? Infinite God—above me—coming to judge me! On the way now. I must meet Him. I know that. I know it, as soon as the Bible declares it. I know it—I do not know how—by an instinct. Even the natural man must picture to himself when thus depicted, and must fear,

"A God in grandeur, and a world on fire."

An infinitely Holy God above me, coming to judge me. That is the second Infinite.

Then the third and what completes the Triangle, and makes its sides eternally, divinely equal—*Infinite Atonement* —an Infinite Saviour—God on the cross making answer to God on the throne—my Jesus—my Refuge—my Everlasting Jehovah.

By these three Infinites—especially this last—this Infinite Atonement, for which my whole being cries out its last cry of exhaustion—by this third side of the stupendous Triangle —the side which, left to myself, I could never make out—the Bible proves itself the soul's Geometry, the one Eternal Mathematics, the true Revelation of God.

We take the ground that these three things—Guilt, God, Atonement—set thus in star-like apposition and conjunction, *speak* from the sky, more piercingly than stars do, saying: "Sinner and sufferer, this Revelation is Divine!"

We take the open ground that a single stray leaf of God's Word, found by the wayside by one who never had seen it before, would convince him at once that the strange and the wonderful words were those of his God—were Divine.

The Scriptures are their own self-evidence. We take the ground that the sun requires no critic—truth no diving-bell. When the sun shines, he *shines* the sun. When God speaks, His evidence is in the *accent* of His words.

How did the prophets of old know, when God spoke to them, that it was God? Did they subject the voice, that shook their every bone, and make their flesh dissolve upon them, to a critical test? Did they put God, so to say—as some of our moderns would seem to have done—into a crucible, into a chemist's retort, in order to certify that He was God? Did they find it necessary to hold the handwriting of God in front of the blow-pipe of anxious philosophical examination, in order to bring out and to make the invisible, visible? The very suggestion is madness.

The Scriptures are their own self-evidence. The refusal

of the Bible on its simple presentation is enough to damn any man, and, if persisted in, will damn him—for

"A glory gilds the sacred page,
Majestic, like the sun;
It gives a light to every age;
It gives, but borrows none."

4. Glory spreads over the face of the Scriptures, but this glory, when scrutinized closely, is seen to contain certain features and outlines—testimonies inside of itself, direct assertions, which conspire to illustrate again its high Divinity, and to *confirm* its claim.

This is our fourth point: THE SCRIPTURES SAY OF THEMSELVES THAT THEY ARE DIVINE. They not only assume it; they say it. And this, "Thus saith the Lord," is intrinsic—a witness inside of the witness, and one upon which something more than conviction—*confidence,* or Spirit-born, and *saving faith*—depends.

The argument from the self-assertion of Scripture is cumulative.

(1) The Bible claims that, as a Book, it comes from God. In various ways it urges this claim.

One thing: *it says so.* "God in old times spake by the prophets; God now speaks by His Son." The question of Inspiration is, in its first statement, the question of Revelation itself. If the Book be Divine, then what it says of itself is Divine. The Scriptures are inspired because they say they are inspired. The question is simply one of Divine testimony, and our business is, as simply, to receive that testimony. "Inspiration is as much an assertion," says Haldane, "as is justification by faith. Both stand and equally, on the authority of Scripture, which is as much an ultimate authority upon this point as upon any other." When God speaks, and when He says, "I speak!" there is the whole of it. He is bound to be heard and obeyed.

In the Bible God speaks, and speaks not only by proxy. Leviticus is a signal example of this. Chapter after chapter of Leviticus begins: "And the Lord spake, saying;" and so it runs on through the chapter. Moses is simply a listener, a scribe. The self-announced Speaker is God.

In the Bible God Himself comes down and speaks, not in the Old Testament alone, and not alone by proxy. "The New Testament presents us," says Dean Burgon, "with the august spectacle of the Ancient of Days holding the entire volume of the Old Testament Scriptures in His hands, and interpreting it of Himself. He, the Incarnate Word, who was in the beginning with God, and who was God—that same Almighty One is set forth in the Gospels as holding the 'volume of the Book' in His hands, as opening and unfolding it, and explaining it everywhere of Himself."

Christ everywhere receives the Scripture, and speaks of the Scriptures, in their entirety—the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, the whole Old Testament canon—as the living Oracle of God. He accepts and He endorses everything written, and even makes most prominent those miracles which infidelity regards as most incredible. And He does all this upon the ground of the authority of God. He passes over the writer—leaves him out of account. In all His quotations from the Old Testament, He mentions but four of the writers by name. The question with Him is not a question of the *reporter,* but of the Dictator.

And this position of our Saviour which exalted Scripture as the mouthpiece of the living God was steadily maintained by the Apostles and the apostolic Church. Again and over again, in the Book of the Acts, in all the Epistles, do we find such expressions as "He saith," "God saith," "The oracles of God," "The Holy Ghost saith," "Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet."

The Epistle to the Hebrews furnishes a splendid illustration of this, where, setting forth the whole economy of the

Mosaic rites, the author adds, "The Holy Ghost this signifying." Further on, and quoting words of Jeremiah, he enforces them with the remark, "The Holy Ghost is witness to us also." The imperial argument on Psalm 95 he clenches with the application, "Wherefore, as the Holy Ghost saith, Today if ye will hear His voice." Throughout the entire Epistle, whoever may have been the writer quoted from, the words of the quotation are referred to God.

(2) But now let us come closer, to the very exact and categorical and unequivocal assertion. *If the Scriptures as a Book are Divine, then what they say of themselves is Divine.* What do they say?

In this inquiry, let us keep our fingers on two words, and always on two words—the apostolic keys to the whole Church position:

"Graphe"—writing, *writing,* the Writing—not somebody, something back of the Writing. The Writing. "He Graphe," *that* was inspired.

And what is meant by inspired? "Theopneustos," God-breathed.

"God breathed!" That sweeps the whole ground. God comes down as a blast on the pipes of an organ—in voice like a whirlwind, or in still whispers like Aeolian tones, and saying the Word, He seizes the hand, and makes that hand in His own the pen of a most ready writer.

Pasa Graphe Theopneustos! "All sacred writing." More exactly, "Every sacred writing," every mark on the parchment, is "God-breathed." So says St. Paul.

Pasa Graphe Theopneustos! The sacred assertion is not of the instruments, but of the Author; not of the agents, but of the product. It is the sole and *sovereign vindication of what has been left on the page when Inspiration gets through.* "What is written," says Jesus, "how readest thou?" Man can only read what is written.

Pasa Graphe Theopneustos! God inspires not men, but language. The phrase, "inspired men," is not found in the Bible. The Scripture never employs it. The Scripture says that "holy men were moved"—pheromenoi—but that their writing, their manuscript, what they put down and left on the page, was God-breathed. You breathe upon a pane of glass. Your breath congeals there; freezes there; stays there; fixes an ice-picture there. That is the notion. The writing on the page beneath the hand of Paul was just as much breathed on, breathed *into* that page, as was His soul breathed into Adam.

The chirograph was God's incarnate voice, as truly as the flesh of Jesus sleeping on the "pillow" was incarnate God.

We take the ground that *on the original parchment*—the membrane—every sentence, word, line, mark, point, pen-stroke jot, tittle was put there by God.

On the *original parchment.* There is no question of other, anterior parchments. Even were we to indulge the violent extra-Scriptural notion that Moses or Matthew transcribed from memory or from other books the things they have left us; still, in any, in every case, the selection, the expression, the shaping and turn of the phrase on the membrane was the work of an unaided God.

But what? Let us have done with extra-Scriptural, presumptous suppositions. The burning Isaiah, the perfervid, wheel-gazing Ezekiel; the ardent, seraphic St. Paul, caught up, up, up, up into that Paradise which he himself calls the "third heaven"—were these men only "copyists," mere self-moved "redactors"? I trow not. Their pens urged, swayed, moved hither and thither by the sweep of a heavenly current, stretched their feathered tops, like that of Luke upon St. Peter's dome, into the far-off Empyrean, winged from the throne of God.

We take the ground that on the original parchment—the membrane—every sentence, word, line, mark, point, pen-stroke jot, tittle was put there by God.

On the *original parchment.* Men may destroy that parchment. Time may destroy it. To say that the membranes have suffered in the hands of men, is but to say that everything Divine must suffer, as the pattern Tabernacle suffered, when committed to our hands. To say, however, that the *writing* has suffered—the words and letters—is to say that Jehovah has failed.

The writing remains. Like that of a palimpsest, it will survive and reappear, no matter what circumstances, what changes, come in to scatter, obscure, disfigure, or blot it away. Not even one lonely THEOS* writ large by the Spirit of God on the Great Uncial "C" as, with my own eyes I have seen it—plain, vivid, glittering, outstarting from behind the pale and overlying ink of Ephraim the Syrian—can be buried. Like Banquo's ghost, it will rise; and God Himself replace it, and, with a hammer-stroke, beat down deleting hands. The parchments, the membranes, decay; the writings, the words, are eternal as God. Strip off the plaister from Belshazzar's palace, yet Mene! Mene! Tekel! Upharsin! remain. They *remain.*

Let us go through them, and from the beginning, and see what the Scriptures say of themselves.

One thing; they say that God spake, "anciently and all the way down, in the prophets." One may make if he pleases the "en" instrumental—as it is more often instrumental—i. e., "by" the prophets; but in either case, in them or by them, the Speaker was God.

Again; the Scriptures say that the laws the writers promulgated, the doctrines they taught, the stories they recorded—above all, their prophecies of Christ—were not their own; were not originated, nor conceived by them from any outside sources—were not what they had any means before of knowing, or of comprehending, but were immediately from God;

*God was manifest in the flesh (1 Tim. 3:16).

they themselves being only recipient, only concurrent with God, as God moved upon them.

Some of the speakers of the Bible, as Balaam, the Old Prophet of Bethel, Caiaphas, are seized and made to speak in spite of themselves; and, with the greatest reluctance, to utter what is farthest from their minds and hearts. Others—in fact all—are purblind to the very oracles, instructions, visions, they announce. "Searching what, or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify!" i. e., the prophets themselves did not know what they wrote. What picture can be more impressive than that of the prophet himself hanging over and contemplating in surprise, in wonder, in amazement, his own autograph—as if it had been left upon the table there—the relict of some strange and supernatural hand? How does that picture lift away the Bible from all human hands and place it back, as His original deposit, in the hands of God.

Again; it is said that "the Word of the Lord came" to such and such a writer. It is not said that the Spirit came, which is true; but that the Word itself came, the Dabar-Jehovah. And it is said: *"Hayo Haya Dabar,"* that it *substantially* came, essentially came; "essendo fuit"—so say Pagninus, Montanus, Polanus—i. e., it came germ, seed and husk and blossom—in its totality—*words* which the Holy Ghost teacheth—the "words."

Again; it is *denied,* and most emphatically, that the words are the words of the man—of the agent. "The word was in my tongue". St. Paul asserts that "Christ spake in him" (2 Cor. 13:3). "Who hath made man's mouth? Have not I, the Lord? I will put *My* words into thy mouth." That looks very much like what has been stigmatized as the "mechanical theory." It surely makes the writer a mere organ, although not an unconscious, or unwilling, unspontaneous organ. Could language more plainly assert or defend a verbal direct inspiration?

In the line with the fact, again it is said that the word came to the writers without any study—"suddenly"—as to Amos where he is taken from following the flock.

Again; when the word thus came to the prophets *they had not the power to conceal it.* It was "like a fire in their bones" which must speak or write, as Jeremiah says, or consume its human receptacle.

And to make this more clear, it is said that holy men were *pheromenoi,* "moved," or rather carried along in a supernatural ecstatic current—a *delectatio scribendi.* They were not left one instant to their wit, wisdom, fancies, memories, or judgments either to order, or arrange, or dispose, or write out. They were *only reporters,* intelligent, conscious, passive, plastic, docile, exact, and accurate reporters. They were like men who wrote with different kinds of ink. They colored their work with tints of their own personality, or rather God colored it, having made the writer as the writing, and the writer for that special writing; and because the work ran *through them* just as the same water, running through glass tubes, yellow, green, red, violet, will be yellow, violet and green, and red.

God wrote the Bible, the whole Bible, and the Bible as a whole. He wrote each word of it as truly as He wrote the Decalogue on the tables of stone.

Higher criticism tells us—the "New Departure" tells us—that Moses was inspired, but the *Decalogue* not. But Exodus and Deuteronomy seven times over declare that God stretched down the tip of His finger from heaven and left the *marks,* the gravements, the cut characters, the scratches on the stones. (Ex. 24:12.) "I will give thee tables of stone, commandments, *which I have written*" (Ex. 31:18). "And He gave unto Moses, upon Mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone *written with the finger of God*" (Ex. 32:16). The tables were the work of God and the *writing was the writing of God,* graven upon the tables. (Deut. 4:12). "The Lord

spake unto you out of the midst of the fire, and He declared unto you His covenant, even ten commandments and *He wrote them* upon two tables of stone" (Deut. 5:22). "These words the Lord spake, and *He wrote them* in two tables of stone, and delivered them unto me" (Deut. 9:10). "And the Lord delivered unto me two tables of stone *written with the finger of God"!*

Seven times, and to men to whom writing is instinct; to beings who are most of all impressed, not by vague vanishing voices, but by words arrested, fixed, set down; and who themselves cannot resist the impulse to commit their own words to some written deposit, even of stone, or of bark, if they have not the paper; seven times, to men, to whom writing is instinct and who are inclined to rely for their highest conviction on what they have styled "documentary evidence," i. e., on books; God comes in and declares, "I have written"!

The Scriptures, whether with the human instrument or without the human instrument, with Moses or without Moses, were written by God. When God had finished, Moses had nothing else to do but carry down God's autograph. That is our doctrine. The Scriptures—if ten words, then all the words—if the law, then the Gospels—the writing, the writings, *He Graphe—Hai Graphai*—expressions repeated more than fifty times in the New Testament alone—*this, these* were inspired.

Brethren, the danger of our present day—the "down grade" as it has been called, of doctrine, of conviction, of the moral sentiment—a decline more constantly patent, as it is more blatantly proclaimed—does it not find its first step in our lost hold upon the very inspiration of the Word of God?

Does not a fresh conviction here lie at the root of every remedy which we desire, as its sad lack lies at the root of every ruin we deplore?

CHAPTER V

THE TESTIMONY OF THE ORGANIC UNITY OF THE BIBLE TO ITS INSPIRATION

BY THE LATE ARTHUR T. PIERSON

The argument for the inspiration of the Bible which I am to present is that drawn from its unity. This unity may be seen in several conspicuous particulars, upon some of which it will be well to dilate.

1. THE UNITY IS STRUCTURAL. In the Book itself appears a certain archetypal, architectural plan. The two Testaments are built on the same general scheme. Each is in three parts: historic, didactic, prophetic; looking to the past, the present, and the future.

Here is a collection of books; in their style and character there is great variety and diversity; some are historical, others poetical; some contain laws, others lyrics; some are prophetic, some symbolic; in the Old Testament we have historical, poetical, and prophetical divisions; and in the New Testament we have historic narratives, then twenty-one epistles, then a symbolic apocalyptic poem in oriental imagery. And yet this is no artificial arrangement of fragments. We find "the Old Testament patent in the New; the New latent in the Old."

In such a Book, then, it is not likely that there would be unity; for all the conditions were unfavorable to a harmonious moral testimony and teaching. Here are some sixty or more separate documents, written by some forty different persons, scattered over wide intervals of space and time, strangers to each other; these documents are written in three different languages, in different lands, among different and sometimes hostile peoples, with marked diversities of literary style, and by men of all grades of culture and mental capacity, from

Moses to Malachi; and when we look into these productions, there is even in them great unlikeness, both in matter and manner of statement; and yet they all constitute one volume.

All are entirely at agreement. There is diversity in unity, and unity in diversity. It is *"e pluribus unum."* The more we study it, the more do its unity and harmony appear. Even the Law and the Gospel are not in conflict. They stand, like the cherubim, facing different ways, but their faces are toward each other. And the four Gospels, like the cherubic creatures in Ezekiel's vision, facing in four different directions, move in one. All the criticism of more than three thousand years has failed to point out one important or irreconcilable contradiction in the testimony and teachings of those who are farthest separated—there is no collision, yet there could be no collusion!

How can this be accounted for? There is no answer which can be given unless you admit the supernatural element. If God actually superintended the production of this Book, then its unity is the unity of a Divine plan and its harmony the harmony of a Supreme Intelligence.

As the baton rises and falls in the hand of the conductor of some grand orchestra, from violin and bass-viol, cornet and flute, trombone and trumpet, flageolet and clarinet, bugle and French horn, cymbals and drum, there comes one grand harmony! There is no doubt, though the conductor were screened from view, that one master mind controls all the instrumental performers. But God makes His oratorio to play for more than a thousand years; the key is never lost and never changes except by those exquisite modulations that show the master composer; and when the last strain dies away it is seen that all these glorious movements and melodies have been variations on one grand theme! Did each musician compose as he played, or was there one composer back of all the players?—"one supreme and regulating mind" in this Oratorio of the Ages? If God was the master musician planning the

whole and arranging the parts, then we can understand how Moses' grand anthem of creation glided into Isaiah's oratorio of the Messiah; by and by sinks into Jeremiah's plaintive wail, swells into Ezekiel's awful chorus, changes into Daniel's rapturous lyric; and, after the quartette of the evangelists, closes with John's full choir of saints and angels!

The temple, first built upon Mount Moriah, was built of stone, made ready before it was brought thither; there was neither hammer nor ax nor any tool of iron heard in the house while it was in building. What insured symmetry in the temple when constructed, and harmony between the workmen in the quarries and the shops, and the builders on the hill? *One presiding mind planned the whole;* one intelligence built that whole structure in ideal before it was in fact. The builders built more wisely than they knew, putting together the ideas of the architect and not their own. Only so can we account for the structural unity of the Word of God. The structure was planned and wrought out in the mind of a Divine Architect, who superintended His own workmen and work. Moses laid its foundations, not knowing who should build after him, or what form the structure should assume. Workman after workman followed; he might see that there was agreement with what went before, but he could not foresee that what should come after would be only the sublime carrying out of the grand plan. During all those sixteen centuries through which the building rose toward completion, there was no sound of ax or hammer, no chipping or hacking to make one part fit its fellow. Everything is in agreement with everything else, because the whole Bible was built in the thought of God before one book was laid in order. The building rose steadily from corner-stone to cap-stone, foundations first, then story after story, pillars on pedestals, and capitals on pillars, and arches on capitals, till, like a dome flashing back the splendors of the noonday, the Apocalypse spans and crowns and completes the whole, glorious with celestial visions.

2. The unity is historic. The whole Bible is the history of the kingdom of God. Israel represents that kingdom. And two things are noticeable. All centers about the Hebrew nationality. With their origin and progress the main historical portion begins; and with their apostasy and captivity it stops. The times of the Gentiles filled the interval and have no proper history; prophecy, which is history anticipated, takes up the broken thread, and gives us the outline of the future when Israel shall again take its place among the nations.

3. The unity is dispensational. There are certain uniform dispensational features which distinguish every new period. Each dispensation is marked by seven features, in the following order: (a) Increased light; (b) Decline of spiritual life; (c) Union between disciples and the world; (d) A gigantic civilization worldly in type; (e) Parallel development of good and evil; (f) Apostasy on the part of God's people; (g) Concluding judgment. We are now in the seventh dispensation, and the same seven marks have been upon all alike, showing one controlling power—*Deus in Historia.*

4. The unity is prophetic. Of all prophecy, there is but one center, The kingdom and the King. 1. Adam, the first king, lost his scepter by sin. His probation ended in failure and disaster. 2. The second Adam, in His probation, gained the victory, routed the tempter, and stood firm. The two comings of this King constituted the two focal centers of the prophetic ellipse. His first coming was to make possible an empire in man and over man. His second coming will be to set that empire up in glory. All prophecy moves about these two advents. It touches Israel only as related to the kingdom; and the Gentiles only as related to Israel. Hence, in the Old Testament, Nineveh, Babylon, and Egypt loom up as the main foes to the kingdom, as represented by the Hebrews; and in the New Testament, the Beast, Prophet, and Dragon are conspicuous as the gigantic adversaries of that kingdom after Israel again takes her place.

There are some six hundred and sixty-six general prophecies in the Old Testament, three hundred and thirty-three of which refer particularly to the coming Messiah, and meet only in Him.

5. THE UNITY IS THEREFORE ALSO PERSONAL:

"In the volume of the Book
It is written of Me."

There is but one Book, and within it but one Person. Christ is the center of the Old Testament prophecy, as He is of New Testament history. From Genesis 3 to Malachi 3, He fills out the historic and prophetic profile. Not only do the three hundred and thirty-three predictions unite in Him, but even the rites and ceremonies find in Him their only interpreter. Nay, historic characters prefigure Him, and historic events are the pictorial illustrations of His vicarious ministry. The Old Testament is a lock of which Christ is the key. The prophetic plant becomes a burning bush, as twig after twig of prediction flames with fulfillment. The crimson thread runs through the whole Bible. Beginning at any point you may preach Jesus. The profile—at first a drawing, without color, a mere outline—is filled in by successive artists, until the life tints glow on the canvas of the centuries, and the perfect portrait of the Messiah is revealed.

6. THE UNITY IS SYMBOLIC. I mean that there is a corresponding use of symbols, whether in form, color, or numbers. In form, we have the square, the cube, and the circle, throughout, and used as types of the same truths. In color, we have the white for purity, the lustrous white for glory, the red for guilt of sin and the sacrifice for sin, the blue for truth and fidelity to promise, the purple for royalty, the pale or livid hue for death, and the black for woe and disaster. In numbers there is plainly a numerical system. One seems to represent unity, two correspondence and confirmation or contradiction, three is the number of Godhead, four of the world and man. Seven, which is the sum of three and four, stands for

the combination of the Divine and human; twelve, the product of three and four, for the Divine interpenetrating the human; ten, the sum of one, two, three, and four, is the number of completeness; three and a half, the broken number, represents tribulation; six, which stops short of seven, is unrest; eight, which is beyond the number of rest, is the number of victory. All this implies one presiding mind, and it could not be man's mind.

7. The unity is didactic. In the entire range and scope of the ethical teaching of the Bible there is no inconsistency or adulteration. But we need to observe a distinction maintained throughout as to natural religion and spiritual religion. There is a natural religion. Had man remained loyal to God, the universal fatherhood of God and the universal brotherhood of man would have been the two great facts and laws of humanity; the broad, adequate basis of the natural claim of God to filial obedience, and of man to fraternal love. But man sinned. He fell from the filial relationship; he disowned God as his Father. Hence, the need of a new and spiritual relationship and religion. In Christ, God's fatherhood is restored and man's brotherhood re-established, but these are treated as universal only to the circle of believers. A new obedience is now enforced, resting its claim, not on creation and providence, but on new creation and grace. Man learns a supernatural love and life.

Upon this didactic unity we stop to expatiate.

In not one respect are these doctrinal and ethical teachings in conflict, from beginning to end; we find in them a positive oneness of doctrine which amazes us. Even where at first glance there appears to be conflict, as between Paul and James, we find, on closer examination, that instead of standing face to face, beating each other, they stand back to back, beating off common foes.

We observe, moreover, *a progressive development of revelation.* Bernhard devoted the powers of his master mind to

tracing the "Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament." He shows that although the books of the New Testament are not even arranged in the order of their production, that order could not, in one instance, be changed without impairing or destroying the symmetry of the whole book; and that there is a regular progress in the unfolding of doctrine from the Gospel according to Matthew to the Revelation of St. John.

A wider examination will show the very same progress of doctrine in the whole Bible. Most wonderful of all, this moral and didactic unity could not be fully understood till the Book was completed. The progress of preparation, like a scaffolding about a building, obscured its beauty; but when John placed the cap-stone in position and declared that nothing further should be added, the scaffolding fell and a grand cathedral was revealed.

8. THE UNITY IS SCIENTIFIC. The Bible is not a scientific book, but it follows one consistent law. Like an engine on its own track, it thunders across the track of science, but is never diverted from its own.

(1). No direct teaching or anticipation of scientific truth is here found. (2). No scientific fact is ever misstated, though common, popular phraseology may be employed. (3). An elastic set of terms is used, which contain, in germ, all scientific truth as the acorn enfolds the oak.

These statements deserve a little amplification, as this has been supposed to be the weak side of the Bible. Yet, after a study of the Word on the one hand and natural science on the other, I believe we may safely challenge any living man to bring one well-established fact of science against which the Bible really and irreconcilably militates!

God led inspired men to use such language, as that without revealing scientific facts in advance, it accurately accommodates itself to them when discovered.

The language is so elastic and flexible as to contract itself to the narrowness of ignorance, and yet expand itself to the

dimensions of knowledge. If the Bible may, from imperfect human language, select terms which may hold hidden truths till ages to come shall disclose the inner meaning, that would seem to be the best solution of this difficult problem. And now, when we come to compare the language of the Bible with modern science, we find just this to be the fact.

For example, we are told that the Bible term "firmament" is but an ancient blunder crystallized. Modern science says, "Ye have heard it hath been said by them of old time, there is a solid sphere above us which revolves with its starry lamps; but this is an old notion of ignorance, for there is nothing but vast space filled with ether above us, and stars have an apparent motion because the earth turns on its axis."

But this word "firmament," which has been declared "irreconcilable with modern astronomy," we find, on consulting our Hebrew lexicon, means simply an "expanse." If Moses had been Mitchell, he could not have chosen a better word to express the appearance, and yet accommodate the reality. He actually anticipated science. This is one of the "mistakes of Moses" to which the modern blasphemer does not refer!

The general correspondence between the Mosaic account of creation and the most advanced discoveries of science, proves that only He who built the world, built the Book.

As to the order of creation, Moses and geology agree. Both teach that at first there was an abyss, or watery waste, whose dense vapors shut out light. Both make life to precede light; and the life to develop beneath the abyss. Both make the atmosphere to form an expanse by lifting watery vapors into cloud, and so separating the fountains of waters above from the fountains below. Both tell us that continents next lifted themselves from beneath the great deep, and brought forth grass, herb, and tree. Both teach that the heavens became cleared of cloud, and the sun and moon and stars, which then appeared, began to serve to divide day from night, and

to become signs for seasons and years. Both then represent the waters bringing forth moving and creeping creatures, and fowl flying in the expanse, followed next by the race of quadruped mammals, and, last of all, by man himself.

There is the same agreement as to the order of animal creation. Geology and comparative anatomy combine to teach that the order was from lower to higher types. First, the fish, in which the proportion of brain to spinal cord is as 2 to 1; then reptiles, in which it is as 2½ to 1; birds, 3 to 1; mammals, 4 to 1; man, 33 to 1. Now, this is exactly the order of Moses. Who told him what modern science has discovered, that fish and reptiles belong below birds? As Mr. Tullidge says: "With the advance of discovery, the opposition supposed to exist between Revelation and Geology has disappeared; and of the eighty theories which the French Institute counted in 1806 as hostile to the Bible, not one now stands."

Take an example of this scientific accuracy from astronomy. Says Jeremiah in 30:22, "The host of heaven cannot be numbered, neither the sand of the sea measured." Hipparchus about a century and a half before Christ, gave the number of stars as 1,022, and Ptolemy, in the beginning of the second century of the Christian era, could find but 1,026. We may, on a clear night, with the unaided eye, see only 1,160 or in the whole celestial sphere, about 3,000. But when the telescope began to be pointed to the heavens, less than three centuries ago, by Galileo, then men began to know that the stars are as countless as the sand on the seashore. When Lord Rosse turned his great mirror to the sky, lo! the number of visible stars increased to nearly 400,000,000! John Herschel resolves the nebulae into suns, and finds in the cloudy scarf about Orion, "a gorgeous bed of stars," and the Milky Way itself proves to be simply a grand procession of stars absolutely without number. And so, the exclamation of the prophet, 600 years before Christ, 2,200 years before Galileo, "the host of heaven cannot be numbered," proves to be not

a wild, poetic exaggeration, but literal truth. Who was Jeremiah's teacher in astronomy?

Let us take an example from natural philosophy. Moses accords with modern discoveries as to the nature of light, in not representing this mystery as being made, but "called forth," commanded to shine. If light be only "a mode of motion," how appropriate such phraseology!

In Job 37: 13, 14, we read of the dayspring that it takes hold of the ends of the earth; it is turned as clay to the seal, and they stand as a garment. The ancient cylindrical seals rolled over the clay, and left an impress of artistic beauty. What was without form before, stood out in bold relief, like sculpture. So, as the earth revolves, and brings each portion of its surface successively under the sun's light and heat, what was before dull, dark, dead, discloses and develops beauty, and the clay stands like a garment, curiously wrought in bold relief and brilliant colors. Considered either as science or poetry, where, in any other book of antiquity, can you find anything equal to that? That phrase, "takes hold of the ends of the earth," conveys the idea of a bending of the rays of light, like the fingers of the hand when they lay hold. When the sunlight would touch the extremities of the earth, it is bent by the atmosphere so as to secure contact, and, but for this, vast portions, out of the direct line of the sun's rays, would be dark, cold and dead. Who taught Job, 1,500 years or more before Christ, to use terms that Longfellow or Tennyson might covet to describe refraction?

"When the morning stars sang together," Job 38:7, has been always taken to be a high flight of poetry. And when in the Psalms, 65:8, we read, "Thou makest the outgoings of the morning and evening to rejoice," the Hebrew word means to give forth a tremulous sound, or to make vibrations—to sing. In these poetic expressions, what scientific truth was wrapped up! Light comes to the eye in undulations or vibrations, as tones of sound to the ear. There is a point at which these

vibrations are too rapid or delicate to be detected by our sense of hearing; then a more delicate organ, the eye, must take note of them; they appeal to the optic nerve instead of the auditory nerve, and as light and not sound. Thus, light really sings. "The lowest audible tone is made by 16.5 vibrations of air per second; the highest, by 38,000; between these extremes lie eleven octaves. Vibrations do not cease at 38,000 but our organs are not fitted to hear beyond those limitations." And so it is literally true that "the morning stars sang together." Here is Divine phraseology that has been standing there for ages uninterrupted. And now we may read it just as it stands: "Thou makest the outgoings [or light radiations] of the morning and evening to sing," i. e., to give forth sound by vibration.

"Solomon, in Eccles. 12:6, has left us a poetic description of death. How that "silver cord" describes the spinal marrow; the "golden bowl", the basin which holds the brain; the "pitcher", the lungs; and the "wheel", the heart!

The circulation of the blood was discovered twenty-six hundred years afterward by Harvey. Is it not very remarkable that the language Solomon uses exactly suits the fact—a wheel pumping up through one pipe to discharge through another?

9. Last of all, THE UNITY OF THE BIBLE IS ORGANIC. And this means it is the unity of organized being. *Organic unity implies three things: first, that all parts are necessary to a complete whole; secondly, that all are necessary to complement each other; and thirdly, that all are pervaded by one life-principle.*

Let us apply these laws to the Word of God.

(1). *All the parts of the Bible are necessary to its completeness.* Organic unity is dependent on the existence and cooperation of organs. An oratorio is not an organic unit. Any part of it may be separated from the rest, or displaced by a new composition.

But if this body of mine loses an eye, a limb, or the smallest joint of the finger, it is forever maimed; its completeness is gone.

Not one of the books of the Bible could be lost without maiming the body of truth here contained. Every book fills a place. None can be omitted.

For example, the Book of Esther has long been criticised as not necessary to the completeness of the Canon, and particularly, because "it does not even once contain the name of God." But that book is the most complete exhibition of the providence of God. It teaches a Divine Hand behind human affairs; unbiased freedom of resolution and action as consistent with God's overruling sovereignty; and all things working together to produce grand results. The book that thus exhibits God's providence does not contain the name of God; perhaps because this book is meant to teach us of the Hidden Hand that, unseen, moves and controls all things.

"Ruth" seems to be only a love-story to some; but how rich this book is in foreshadowings of Gospel truth, especially illustrating the double nature of the God-man, our Redeemer.

Boaz is a type of Christ—Lord of the Harvest, Dispenser of Bread, Giver of Rest, He is Goël—the Redeemer. Boaz, the near kinsman, buying back the lost inheritance and marrying Ruth, suggests Jesus, the God-man, our near Kinsman, yet of a higher family, the Redeemer of our lost estate, and Bridegroom of the redeemed Church.

The Epistle to Philemon seems at first only a letter to a friend about a runaway slave. But this letter is full of illustrations of grace. The sinner has run away from God, and robbed Him besides. The law allows him no right of asylum; but grace concedes him the privilege of appeal. Christ, God's Partner, intercedes. He sends him back to the Father, no more a slave but a son.

(2). *The second law of organic unity is that all parts are necessary to complement each other.*

Cuvier has framed in scientific statement this law of unity. Organized being in every case forms a whole—a complete system—all parts of which mutually correspond; none of these parts can change without the other also changing; and consequently each taken separately indicates and gives all the others. For instance, the sharp-pointed tooth of the lion requires a strong jaw; these demand a skull fitted for the attachment of powerful muscles, both for moving the jaw and raising the head; a broad, well developed shoulder-blade must accompany such a head; and there must be an arrangement of bones of the leg which admits of the leg-paw being rotated and turned upward, in order to be used as an instrument to seize and tear the prey; and of course there must be strong claws arming the paw. Hence from one tooth, the animal could be modeled though the species had perished.

Thus the Four Gospels are necessary to each other and to the whole Bible. Each presents the subject from a different point of view, and the combination gives us a Divine Person reflected, projected before us, like an object with proportions and dimensions.

Matthew wrote for the Jew, and shows Jesus as the King of the Jews, the Royal Lawgiver. Mark wrote for the Roman, and shows Him as the Power of God, the Mighty Worker. Luke wrote for the Greek, and shows Him as the Wisdom of God, the human Teacher and Friend. John, writing to supplement and complement the other Gospels, shows Him as Son of God, as well as Son of man, having and giving eternal life.

These are not Gospels of Matthew, etc., but one Gospel of Christ, according to Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. The first three present the person and work of Christ from the outward, earthly side; the last, from the inward and heavenly. In the beginning of each Gospel we find emphasized: in Matthew, Christ's genealogy, in Mark His majesty, in Luke His humanity, in John His divinity. So, in the close of each:

in Matthew His resurrection, in Mark His ascension, in Luke His parting benediction and promise of enduement, and in John the added hint of His second coming.

The Epistles are likewise all necessary to complete the whole and complement each other. There are five writers, each having his own sphere of truth. Paul's great theme is Faith, and its relations to justification, sanctification, service, joy and glory. James treats of Works, their relation to faith, as its justification before man. He is the counterpart and complement of Paul. Peter deals with Hope, as the inspiration of God's pilgrim people. John's theme is Love, and its relation to the light and life of God as manifested in the believer. In his Gospel, he exhibits eternal life in Christ; in his epistles, eternal life as seen in the believer. Jude sounds the trumpet of warning against apostasy, which implies the wreck of faith, the delusion of false hope, love grown cold, and the utter decay of good works. What one of all these writers could we drop from the New Testament?

The Unity of the Bible is the unity of one organic whole. The decalogue demands the Sermon on the Mount. Isaiah's prophecy makes necessary the narrative of the Evangelists. Daniel fits into the Revelation as bone fits socket. Leviticus explains, and is explained by, the Epistle to the Hebrews. The Psalms express the highest morality and spirituality of the Old Testament; they link the Mosaic code with the Divine ethics of the Gospels and the Epistles. The passover foreshadows the Lord's supper, and the Lord's supper interprets and fulfills the passover. Even the little book of Jonah makes more complete the sublime Gospel according to John; and Ruth and Esther prophetically hint the Acts of the Apostles. Nay, when you come to the last chapters of Revelation, you find yourself mysteriously touching the first chapters of Genesis; and lo! as you survey the whole track of your thought, you find you have been following the perimeter of a golden ring; the extremities actually bend around, touch,

and blend. You read in the first of Genesis of the first creation; in the last of the Revelation, of the new creation—the new heaven and the new earth; there, of the river that watered the garden; here, of the pure river of the water of life; there, of the Tree of Life in the first Eden; here, of the Tree of Life which is in the midst of the Paradise of God; there, of the God who came down to walk with and talk with man; here, we read that the Tabernacle of God is with men; there, we read of the curse that came by sin, here, we read: "And there shall be no more curse."

(3). *The third and last law of organic unity is, that one life principle must pervade the whole.* The Life of God is in His Word. That Word is "quick"—living. Is it a mirror? yes, but such a mirror as the living eye; is it a seed? yes, but a seed hiding the vitality of God; is it a sword? yes, but a sword that omnisciently discerns and omnipotently pierces the human heart. Hold it reverently; for you have a living Book in your hand. Speak to it, and it will answer you. Bend down and listen; you shall hear in it the heart-throbs of God.

This Book, thus *one,* we are to hold forth as the Word of Life and the Light of God, in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation. We shall meet opposition. Like the birds that beat themselves into insensibility against the light in the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor, the creatures of darkness will assault this Word, and vainly seek to put out its eternal light. But they shall only fall stunned and defeated at its base, while it still rises from its rock pedestal, immovable and serene!

CHAPTER VI

FULFILLED PROPHECY A POTENT ARGUMENT FOR THE BIBLE

BY ARNO C. GAEBELEIN,
EDITOR "OUR HOPE," NEW YORK CITY.

"Produce your cause, saith the Lord; bring forth your strong reasons, saith the King of Jacob. Let them bring them forth, and show us what shall happen; let them show the former things, what they be, that we may consider them, and know the latter end of them, or declare us things to come. Show the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know, that ye are gods" (Isa. 41:21-23). "I declare the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure" (Isa. 46:10).

This is Jehovah's challenge to the idol-gods of Babylon to predict future events. He alone can do that. The Lord can declare the end from the beginning, and make known things that are not yet done. The dumb idols of the heathen know nothing concerning the future. They cannot predict what is going to happen. And man himself is powerless to know future events and cannot find out things to come.

Jehovah, who has made this challenge and declaration, has also fully demonstrated His power to do so. He has done it in His holy Word, the Bible. Other nations possess books of a religious character, called "sacred books." Not one of them contains any predictions concerning the future. If the authors of these writings had attempted to foretell the future, they would have thereby furnished the strongest evidence of their deceptions. The Bible is the *only* book in the world which contains predictions. It is pre-eminently that, which no other

book could be, and none other is, a book of prophecy. These predictions are declared to be the utterances of Jehovah; they show that the Bible is a supernatural book, the revelation of God.

PROPHECY NEGLECTED AND DENIED

In view of this fact it is deplorable that the professing Church of today almost completely ignores and neglects the study of prophecy, a neglect which has for one of its results the loss of one of the most powerful weapons against infidelity. The denial of the Bible as the inspired Word of God has become widespread.

If prophecy were intelligently studied such a denial could not flourish as it does, for the fulfilled predictions of the Bible give the clearest and most conclusive evidence that the Bible is the revelation of God. To this must be added the fact that the destructive Bible criticism, which goes by the name of "Higher Criticism," denies the possibility of prophecy. The whole reasoning method of this school, which has become so popular throughout Christendom, may be reduced to the following: Prophecy is an impossibility; there is no such thing as foretelling future events. Therefore a book which contains predictions of things to come, which were later fulfilled, must have been written after the events which are predicted in the book. The methods followed by the critics, the attacks made by them upon the authenticity of the different books of the Bible, especially upon those which contain the most startling prophecies (Isaiah and Daniel), we cannot follow at this time. They deny everything which the Jewish Synagogue and the Christian Church always believed to be prophecy, a supernatural unfolding of future events.

PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE

The prophecies of the Bible must be first of all divided into three classes. 1. Prophecies which have found already

their fulfillment. 2. Prophecies which are now in process of fulfillment. Many predictions written several thousand years ago are now being accomplished before our eyes. We mention those which relate to the national and spiritual condition of the Jewish people and the predictions concerning the moral and religious condition of the present age. 3. Prophecies which are still unfulfilled. We have reference to those which predict the second, glorious and visible coming of our Lord, the re-gathering of Israel and their restoration to the land of promise, judgments which will fall upon the nations of the earth, the establishment of the Kingdom, the conversion of the world, universal peace and righteousness, the deliverance of groaning creation, and others.

These great prophecies of future things are often robbed of their literal and solemn meaning by a process of spiritualization. The visions of the prophets concerning Israel and Jerusalem, and the glories to come in a future age, are almost generally explained as having their fulfillment in the Church during the present age. However, our object is not to follow the unfulfilled prophecies, but prophecies fulfilled and in process of fulfillment. At the close of our treatise we shall point out briefly that in the light of fulfilled prophecies, the literal fulfillment of prophecies still future is perfectly assured.

FULFILLED PROPHECY A VAST THEME

Fulfilled prophecy is a vast theme of much importance. It is equally inspiring and interesting. Volumes could be written to show how hundreds of Divine predictions written in the Bible have passed into history. What God announced through His chosen instruments has come to pass. History is bearing witness to the fact that the events which transpired among nations were pre-written in the Bible, even as prophecy is nothing less than history written in advance. As much as space permits we shall call attention to the fulfilled prophecies relating to the person of Christ; to the Jewish people; and

to a number of nations, whose history, whose rise and downfall, are divinely predicted in the Bible. Furthermore, we shall mention the great prophetic unfoldings as given in the Book of Daniel, and how many of these predictions have already found a most interesting fulfillment.

MESSIANIC PROPHECIES AND THEIR FULFILLMENT

The Old Testament contains a most wonderful chain of prophecies concerning the person, the life and work of our Lord. As He is the center of the whole revelation of God, the One upon whom all rests, we turn first of all to a few of the prophecies which speak of Him. This also is very necessary. The destructive criticism has gone so far as to state that there are no predictions at all concerning Christ in the Old Testament. Such a denial leads to and is linked with the denial of Christ Himself, especially the denial of His Deity and His work on the cross.

To follow the large number of prophecies concerning the coming of Christ into the world and the work He was to accomplish we cannot attempt in these pages. We point out briefly in a general way what must be familiar to most Christians who search the Scriptures. Christ is first announced in Gen. 3:15 to be the seed of the woman, and therefore a human being. In Gen. 9:26-27 the supremacy of Shem is predicted. The full revelation of Jehovah God is connected with Shem and in due time a son of Shem, Abraham, received the promise that the predicted seed was to come from him. (Gen. 12:8.) Messiah was to come from the seed of Abraham.

Then the fact was revealed that He was to come from Isaac and not from Ishmael, from Jacob and not from Esau. But Jacob had twelve sons. The Divine prediction pointed to Judah and later to the house of David of the tribe of Judah from which the Messiah should spring. When we come to the prophecies of Isaiah we learn that His mother is to be a virgin. (Isa. 7:14.) But the son born of the virgin is

Immanuel, God with us. Clearly the prophetic Word in Isaiah states that the Messiah would be a child born and a Son given with the names, "Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace" (Isa. 9:6). The promised Messiah is to be the seed of a woman, of the seed of Abraham, of David, born of a virgin. He is to be Immanuel, the Son given, God manifested in the flesh.

This promised Messiah, the Son of David, should appear (according to Isa. 11:1) after the house of David had been stripped of its royal dignity and glory. And what more could we say of the prophecies which speak of His life, His poverty, the works He was to do, His rejection by His own people, the Jews. In that matchless chapter in Isaiah, the fifty-third, the rejection of Christ by His own nation is predicted. In another chapter a still more startling prophecy is recorded: "Then I said, I have labored in vain, I have spent my strength for naught and in vain." This is Messiah's lament on account of His rejection. Then follows the answer, which contains a most striking prophecy: "It is a light thing that Thou shouldest be My servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the preserved of Israel: I also will give Thee for a light to the Gentiles, that Thou mayest be My salvation unto the ends of the earth" (Isa. 49:5, 6). Here the revelation is given that He would not alone be rejected by His own nation, but that He would also bring salvation to the Gentiles. What human mind could have ever invented such a program! The promised Messiah of Israel, the longed-for One, is predicted to be rejected by His own people and thus becomes the Saviour of the despised Gentiles. His sufferings and His death are even more minutely predicted.

In the Book of Psalms the sufferings of Christ, the deep agony of His soul, the expressions of His sorrow and His grief, are pre-written by the Spirit of God. We mention only one Psalm, the twenty-second. His death by crucifixion is prophesied. Yet death by crucifixion was in David's time an un-

known mode of death. Cruel Rome invented that horrible form of death. The cry of the forsaken One is predicted in the very words which came from the lips of our Saviour out of the darkness which enshrouded the cross. So are also predicted the words of mockery by those who looked on; the piercing of His hands and feet; the parting of the garments and the casting of the lots. In the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, the purpose of His death is so blessedly predicted. He was to die the substitute of sinners. There we find also His burial and His resurrection predicted. All this was recorded 700 years before our Lord was born. In the Psalms we find the prophecy that the rejected One would occupy a place at the right hand of God (Psalm 110:1). He was to leave the earth. David's Son and David's Lord was to have a place in the highest glory, even at the right hand of God, to wait there till His enemies are made His footstool. It is indeed a wonderful chain of prophecies concerning Christ. We could give a very few of these predictions. How they all were long ago literally fulfilled in the coming, in the life, in the death, in the resurrection and ascension of our adorable Lord, all true believers know.

THE JEWISH PEOPLE

When Frederick the Great, King of Prussia, asked the court chaplain for an argument that the Bible is an inspired book, he answered, "Your Majesty, the Jews." It was well said. To the Jews were committed the oracles of God. (Rom. 3:2.) These oracles of God, the Holy Scriptures, the Law and the Prophets, are filled with a large number of predictions relating to their own history. Their unbelief, the rejection of the Messiah, the results of that rejection, their dispersion into the corners of the earth, so that they would be scattered among all the nations, the persecutions and sorrows they were to suffer, the curses which were to come upon them, their miraculous preservation as a nation, their future great tribulation and

final restoration—all these and much more were over and over announced by their own prophets. All the different epochs of the remarkable history of Israel were predicted long before they were reached. Their sojourn in Egypt and servitude, as well as the duration of that period, was announced to Abraham. The Babylonian captivity of 70 years and the return of a remnant to occupy the land once more was announced by the pre-exile prophets, who also predicted a far greater and longer exile, their present world-wide dispersion and a return which up to 1914 has not yet come. Of the deepest interest and the greatest importance in connection with the predictions of the return from Babylon is the naming of the great Persian king through whom the return was to be achieved. This great prophecy is found in the Book of Isaiah: "That saith of Cyrus, He is My shepherd, and shall perform all My pleasure: even saying of Jerusalem, She shall be built; and of the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid. Thus saith Jehovah to His anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open the doors before him, and the gates shall not be shut" (Isa. 44:28; 45:1). This prediction was made about 200 years before Cyrus was born. A careful study of the part of Isaiah where these words are found will show that they are linked with the challenge of Jehovah and the declaration that He knows the end from the beginning; the passages we have already quoted. In naming an unborn king and showing what his work would be, Jehovah demonstrates that He knows the future. The great Jewish historian, Josephus, informs us that when Cyrus found his name in the Book of Isaiah, written about 200 years before, an earnest desire laid hold upon him to fulfill what was written. The beginning of the Book of Ezra gives the proclamation of Cyrus concerning the temple.

When the Prophet Isaiah received the message which contained the name of the Persian king, he wrote it down faith-

fully, though he did not know who Cyrus was. Two centuries later Cyrus appeared and then issued his proclamation which fulfilled Isaiah's prediction. Higher criticism denies the genuineness of all this. In order to disprove this prophecy as well as others, they declare that Isaiah did not write the book which bears his name. For about 2500 years no one ever thought of even suggesting that Isaiah is not the author of the book. They have invented an unknown person, whom they call Deutero-Isaiah, i. e., a second Isaiah. They claim that he wrote chapters 40-66. With this they have not stopped. They speak now of a third Isaiah, a Trito-Isaiah, as they call him. With their supposed learning they claim to have discovered that some of the chapters of Isaiah were written in Babylon and others in Palestine. However, all the arguments, advanced by the critics for a composite authorship and against one Isaiah who lived and wrote his book at the time specified in the beginning of Isaiah, are disproven by the book itself. One only needs to study this book to find out the unity of the message. One person must be the author of the Book of Isaiah.

A REMARKABLE CHAPTER

The Pentateuch contains many of the prophecies concerning the future history of the Jews. One of the most remarkable chapters is the twenty-eighth chapter in Deuteronomy.

It is one of the most solemn chapters in the Pentateuch. Orthodox Hebrews read in their synagogues each year through the entire five books of Moses. When they read this chapter, the Rabbi reads in a subdued voice. And well may they read it softly and ponder over it, for here is pre-written the sad and sorrowful history of their wonderful nation. Here thousands of years ago the Spirit of God through Moses outlined the history of the scattered nation, all their suffering and tribulation, as it has been for well nigh two millenniums and as it is

still. Here are arguments for the Divine, the supernatural origin of this book which no infidel has ever been able to answer; nor will there ever be found an answer.

It would take many pages to follow the different predictions and show their literal fulfillment in the nation which turned away from Jehovah and disobeyed His Word.

Apart from such general predictions as are found in verses 64-66 and fulfilled in the dispersion of Israel, there are others which are more minute. The Roman power, which was used to break the Jews, is clearly predicted by Moses, and that in a time when no such power existed. Read verses 49-50: "The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of the earth, as swift as the *eagle* flieth, a nation, whose language thou shalt not understand." The eagle was the standard of the Roman armies; the Jews understood many oriental languages, but were ignorant of Latin. "Which shall not regard the person of the old, nor show favor to the young." Rome killed the old people and the children. "And he shall besiege thee in all thy gates, until thy high and fenced walls come down, wherein thou trustedst, throughout all thy land" (verse 52). Fulfilled in the siege and overthrow of Jerusalem by the Roman legions. "The tender and delicate woman among you, which would not adventure to set the sole of her foot upon the ground for delicateness and tenderness, shall eat her children, for want of all things in the siege and straitness wherewith thine enemy shall distress thee in thy gates" (54-57). Fulfilled in the dreadful sieges of Jerusalem, perhaps the most terrible events in the history of blood and tears of this poor earth. Every verse, beginning with the fifteenth, to the end of this chapter has found its oft repeated fulfillment. It does not surprise us that the enemy hates this book, which bears such a testimony, and would have it classed with legends.

Of much interest is the last verse of this great prophetic chapter. "And Jehovah will bring thee into Egypt again with ships, by the way whereof I said unto thee, Thou shalt see it

no more again; and there ye shall sell yourselves unto your enemies for bondmen and bondwomen, and no man shall buy you." When Jerusalem was destroyed by the Romans, all who did not die in the awful calamity were sent to the mines of Egypt, where the slaves were constantly kept at work without being permitted to rest or sleep till they succumbed. The whip of Egypt fell once more upon them and they suffered the most terrible agonies. Others were sold as slaves. According to Josephus, about 100,000 were made slaves so that the markets were glutted and the word fulfilled, "No man shall buy you."

THEIR DISPERSION AND PRESERVATION

When Balaam beheld the camp of Israel he uttered a prophecy which is still being fulfilled. "Lo, the people shall dwell alone and shall not be reckoned among the nations" (Num. 23:9). God had separated the nation and given to them a land. And this peculiar people, living in one of the smallest countries of the earth, has been scattered throughout the world, has become a wanderer, without a home, without a land. Like Cain they wander from nation to nation. Though without a land they are still a nation. Other nations have passed away; the Jewish nation has been preserved. They are among all the nations and yet not reckoned among the nations. All this is written beforehand in the Bible. "And you will I scatter among the nations, and I will draw out the sword after you: and your land shall be a desolation and your cities shall be a waste" (Lev. 26:33). "And Jehovah will scatter you among the people, and ye shall be left few in number among the nations, whither Jehovah shall lead you away" (Deut. 4:27). "And Jehovah will scatter you among all peoples, from the one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth; and there thou shalt serve other gods, which thou hast not known, thou nor thy fathers, even wood and stone. And among these nations shalt thou find no ease, and there shall

be no rest for the sole of thy foot; but Jehovah will give thee there a trembling heart, and failing of eyes, and pining of soul. And thy life shall hang in doubt before thee; and thou shalt fear night and day, and shalt have no assurance of thy life. In the morning thou shalt say, Would it were even! and at even thou shalt say, Would it were morning! for the fear of thy heart which thou shalt fear, and for the sight of thine eyes, which thou shalt see" (Deut. 28:64-67). "And yet for all that, when they be in the land of their enemies, I will not reject them, neither will I abhor them, to destroy them utterly, and to break My covenant with them; for I am Jehovah their God" (Lev. 26:44). In many other passages the Spirit of God predicts their miraculous preservation.

"Massacred by thousands, yet springing up again from their undying stock, the Jews appear at all times and in all regions. Their perpetuity, their national immortality, is at once the most curious problem to the political inquirer; to the religious man a subject of profound and awful admiration."* Herder called the Jews "the enigma of history". What human mind could have ever foreseen that this peculiar people, dwelling in a peculiar land, was to be scattered among all nations, suffer there as no other nation ever suffered, and yet be kept and thus marked out still as the covenant people of a God, whose gifts and callings are without repentance. Here indeed is an argument for the Word of God which no infidel can answer. Jehovah has predicted the history of His earthly people. "Though I make a full end of all nations whither I have scattered thee, yet will I not make a full end of thee" (Jer. 30:11).

THE LAND AND THE CITY

Palestine, the God-given home of Israel, the land which once flowed with milk and honey, has become barren and desolate. Jerusalem, once a great city, the hallowed city of

*Milman: "History of the Jews."

David, is trodden down by the Gentiles. All this is more than once predicted in the Word of Prophecy. "I will make thee a wilderness, and cities which are not inhabited. And I will prepare destroyers against thee, every one with his weapons; and they shall cut down thy choice cedars, and cast them into the fire. And many nations shall pass by this city, and they shall say every man to his neighbor, Wherefore has the Lord done thus unto this great city? Then they shall answer, Because they have forsaken the covenant of the Lord their God, and worshipped other gods and served them" (Jer. 22:7-9). "And the generation to come, your children that shall rise up after you, and the foreigner that shall come from a far land shall say, when they shall see the plagues of that land . . . even all the nations shall say, Wherefore hath Jehovah done thus unto this land, what meaneth the heat of this great anger?" (Deut. 29:22-25.)

Thus it has come to pass. Their land is being visited by Gentiles from all over the world who behold the desolations. Many other passages could be added to the above—passages which prophesied the very condition of the promised land and the city of Jerusalem which are found there now, and which have existed for nearly two thousand years.

The national rejection of Israel and the fulfillment of the threatened curses have come to pass, and the land in its barren condition witnesses to it. Even the duration of all this is indicated in the prophetic Word. There is a striking passage in Hosea. "I will go and return to My place, till they acknowledge their offence and seek My face; in their affliction they will seek Me early. Come, let us return unto the Lord; for He hath torn, and He will heal us; He hath smitten and He will bind us up. After two days will He revive us; in the third day He will raise us up, and we shall live in His sight" (Hos. 5:15—6:2). According to this prophecy Jehovah is to be in their midst and is to return to His place. It refers to the manifestation of the Lord Jesus Christ among His people.

They rejected Him; He returned to His place. They are to acknowledge their offence.

Elsewhere in the Word predictions are found which speak of a future national repentance of Israel when the remnant of that nation will confess the blood-guiltiness which is upon them. According to this word in Hosea, they are going to have affliction, and when that great affliction comes they will seek His face, and confess their sins, and express their trust in Jehovah. They acknowledge that for two days they were torn and smitten by the judgments of the Lord, afflicted, as predicted by their own prophets. A third day is coming when all will be changed. These days are prophetic days. Several ancient Jewish expositors mention the fact that these days stand each for a thousand years. The two days of affliction and dispersion would therefore stand for two thousand years, and they are almost expired. The third day would mean the day of the Lord, the thousand years of the kingdom to come.

Nor must we forget that our Lord Jesus Christ, too, predicted the great dispersion of the nation, the fall of Jerusalem, and that Gentiles were to rule over that city, till the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled. (Luke 21:10-24.)

NO GOVERNMENT, NO SACRIFICE, NO HOLY PLACE

"For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without teraphim" (Hos. 3:4). No further comment is needed on this striking prediction. Their political and religious condition for 1900 years corresponds to every word given through Hosea the prophet.

PROPHECIES ABOUT OTHER NATIONS

Besides the many predictions concerning the people Israel, the prophets have much to say about the nations with whom Israel came in touch and whose history is bound up with the

history of the chosen people of God. Babylonia, Assyria, Egypt, Ammon, Moab, Tyre, Sidon, Idumea, and others are mentioned in the Prophetic Word. Their ultimate fate was predicted by Jehovah long before their downfall and overthrow occurred. The Prophet Ezekiel was entrusted with many of the solemn messages announcing the judgment of these nations. The reader will find these predictions in chapters 25-37. The predictions concerning Ammon, Moab, Edom and the Philistines are recorded in the twenty-fifth chapter. Tyrus and its fall is the subject of chapters 26 to 28:19. A prophecy about Sidon is found in the concluding verses of the twenty-eighth chapter. The prophecies concerning the judgment and degradation of Egypt are given at greater length in chapters 29 and 30. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Amos, Obadiah, Micah, Nahum and Habakkuk, all contain prophecies concerning different nations foretelling what should happen to them. A mass of evidence can be produced to show that all these predictions came true. Many of them seemed to fail, but after centuries had passed, their literal fulfillment, even to the minutest detail, had become history.

We must confine ourselves to a very few of these predictions and their fulfillment. The siege and capture of the powerful and extremely wealthy city of Tyrus by Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, is predicted in Ezek. 26:7-11. It came literally to pass. One of the proofs is to be found in a contract tablet in the British Museum dated at Tyrus in the fortieth year of the king. The overthrow predicted by Ezekiel had come to pass. The walls were broken down and the city was ruined. The noise of the song ceased and the sound of the harps was no more heard. But not all that Ezekiel predicted had been fulfilled by the Babylonian conqueror. The Divine prediction states, "They shall lay thy stones and thy timber and thy dust in the midst of the water" (verse 12). Nebuchadnezzar had not done this. History acquaints us with the fact that the Tyrians, before the destruction of the city had come, had

removed their treasures to an island about half a mile from the shore. About 250 years later Alexander came against the island city. The ruins of Tyre which Nebuchadnezzar had left standing were used by Alexander. He constructed out of them with great ingenuity and perseverance a dam from the mainland to the rock city in the sea. Thus literally it was fulfilled, "They shall lay thy stones and thy timber and thy dust in the midst of the water." The sentence pronounced upon that proud city, for so long the powerful mistress of the sea, "Thou shalt be built no more," has been fully carried out.

Of still greater interest are the prophecies which foretell the doom of Egypt. Ezekiel and Nahum mention the Egyptian city No. (Ezek. 30:14-16; Nah. 3:8.) No is Thebes and was the ancient capital of Egypt. The Egyptian name is No-Amon. It had a hundred gates, as we learn from Homer, and was a city of marvelous beauty. It was surrounded by walls twenty-four feet thick, and had a circumference of one mile and three quarters. The Lord announced through Ezekiel that this great city should be rent asunder and that its vast population should be cut off. Five hundred years later Ptolemy Laltyrus, the grandfather of Cleopatra, after besieging the city several years razed to the ground the previously ruined city. Every word given through Ezekiel had come true. One could fill many pages showing the literal fulfillment of Ezekiel's great predictions relating to Egypt. The decline and degradation predicted has come true. The rivers and canals of Egypt have dried up. The land has become desolate. The immense fisheries which yielded such a great income to the rulers of Egypt are no longer in existence. Ezek. 30:7 has found a literal fulfillment. Egypt is a land of ruins and wasted cities. The instruments whom God used in accomplishing this were strangers (Ezek. 30:12) like Cambyses, Amroo, Ochus and others. "There shall be no more a prince of the land of Egypt" (Ezek. 30:13). This too has been literally fulfilled. Ochus subdued rebellious Egypt 350 B. C., and since that

time no native prince has ruled in Egypt. It is also written that Egypt should become the basest of the kingdoms, "Neither shall it exalt itself any more above the nations; for I will diminish them that they shall no more rule over the nations." This degradation has fully come to pass. Who would ever have thought that this magnificent country with its vast resources, its wonderful commerce, its great prosperity, its luxuries, the land of marvelous structures, could ever experience such a downfall! Another significant fact is that in spite of the great humiliation and degradation through which Egypt has passed for so many centuries, it is not to experience a total extinction. In this respect her fate differs from that of other nations, "They shall be there a base kingdom" (Ezek. 29:14); this is the condition of Egypt today. And other prophets announce the same fact. One of the earliest prophets is Joel. He prophesied between 860 and 850 B. C. He predicted at that early date, "Egypt shall be a desolation." Isaiah also foretells the awful judgment of this great land of ancient culture. In the light of unfulfilled prophecy we discover the reason why God has not permitted the complete extinction of Egypt. Egypt is yet to be lifted out of the dust and is to receive a place of blessing only second to that of Israel (Isa. 19:22-25). This will be fulfilled when our Lord comes again.

And what more could we say of Idumea, Babylonia, Assyria and other lands. Moab and Ammon, the enemies of Israel, once flourishing nations, have passed away and the numerous judgment predictions have come true. (See Jer. 48-49.) Edom is gone. "O thou that dwellest in the clefts of the rock, that holdest the height of the hill, though thou shouldest make thy nest as high as the eagle, I will bring thee down from thence, saith Jehovah" (Jer. 49:16). "Thou shalt be desolate, O Mount Seir, and all Idumea, even all of it" (Ezek. 35:15). It was an atheist who was first used to report that during a journey of eight days he had found in the territory of Idumea the ruins of thirty cities.

Babylonia and Assyria, once the granaries of Asia, the garden spots of that continent, enjoying a great civilization, are now in desolation and mostly unproductive deserts. The predictions of Isaiah and Jeremiah have been fulfilled. The judgments predicted to come upon Babylon were also fulfilled long ago.*

THE BOOK OF DANIEL

The Book of Daniel, however, supplies the most startling evidences of fulfilled prophecy. No other book has been so much attacked as this great book. For about two thousand years wicked men, heathen philosophers, and infidels have tried to break down its authority. It has proven to be the anvil upon which the critics' hammers have been broken to pieces. The Book of Daniel has survived all attacks. It has been denied that Daniel wrote the book during the Babylonian captivity. The critics claim that it was written during the time of the Maccabees. Kuenen, Wellhausen, Canon Farrar, Driver and others but repeat the statements of the assailant of Christianity of the third century, the heathen Porphyry, who contended that the Book of Daniel was a forgery. Such is the company in which the higher critics are found. The Book of Daniel has been completely vindicated. The prophet wrote the book and its magnificent prophecies in Babylon. All doubt as to that has been forever removed, and men who still repeat the infidel oppositions against the book, oppositions of a past

*"How utterly improbable it must have sounded to the contemporaries of Isaiah and Jeremiah, that the great Babylon, this oldest metropolis of the world, founded by Nimrod, planned to be a city on the Euphrates much larger than Paris of today, surrounded by walls four hundred feet high, on the top of which four chariots, each drawn by four horses, could be driven side by side; in the center a large, magnificent park an hour's walk in circumference, watered by machinery; in it the king's twelve palaces, surrounding the great temple of the sun-god with its six hundred-foot tower and its gigantic golden statue—should be converted into a heap of ruins in the midst of a desert! Who today would have any faith in a similar prophecy against Berlin or London or Paris or New York?" (Prof. Bettex.)

generation, must be branded as ignorant, or considered the willful enemies of the Bible.

NEBUCHADNEZZAR'S GREAT DREAM

The great dream of Nebuchadnezzar is recorded in the second chapter of the Book of Daniel. Nebuchadnezzar who had been constituted by Jehovah a great monarch over the earth (Jer. 27:5-9) desired to know the future. All his astrologers and soothsayers, his magicians and mediums, could not do that. Their predictions left him still in doubt (Dan. 2:29). God gave him then a dream which contained a most remarkable revelation. The great man-image the king beheld is the symbol of the great world empires which were to follow the Babylonian empire. The image had a head of gold; the chest and arms were of silver; the trunk and the thighs were of brass; the two legs of iron, and the two feet were composed of iron mixed with clay. The Lord made known through the prophet the meaning of this dream.

Nebuchadnezzar and the empire over which he ruled is symbolized by the golden head. An inferior kingdom was to come after the Babylonian Empire; its symbol is silver. This kingdom was to be followed by a third kingdom of brass to bear rule over all the earth. The fourth kingdom was to be strong as iron and was to subdue all things. Exactly three great world powers came after the Babylonian Empire, the Medo-Persian, the Graeco-Macedonian and the Roman. Interesting it is to learn, from the different metals of which the image was composed, the process of deterioration which was to characterize the successive monarchies. The fourth empire, the Roman world power, is seen in its historic division, indicated by the two legs. The empire consisted of two parts, the East and West Roman sections. Then the division of the Empire into kingdoms in which iron (monarchical form of government) and the clay (the rule of the people) should be present is also predicted. How all this has come to pass is

too well known to need any further demonstration. These empires have come and gone and the territory of the old Roman Empire presents today the very condition as predicted in Nebuchadnezzar's dream. Monarchies and republics are in existence upon that territory. The final division into ten kingdoms has not yet been accomplished. The unfulfilled portion of this dream we do not follow here. The reader may find this explained in the author's exposition of Daniel.

DANIEL'S GREAT VISION OF THE WORLD POWERS

In the seventh chapter Daniel relates his first great vision. The four beasts he saw rising out of the sea, the type of nations, are symbolical of the same world powers. The lion with eagle's wings is Babylonia. Jeremiah also pictured Nebuchadnezzar as a lion. "The lion has come up from his thicket and the destroyer of the Gentiles is on his way" (Jer. 4:7). Ezekiel speaks of him as a great eagle. (Ezek. 17:3.) The Medo-Persian Empire is seen as a bear raised up on one side and having three ribs in its mouth. The one side appeared stronger because this second world empire had Persia for its stronger element. The three ribs the bear holds as prey predict the conquests of that empire. Medo-Persia conquered exactly three great provinces, Susiana, Lydia and Asia Minor. The leopard with four wings and four heads is the picture of the Graeco-Macedonian Empire. The four wings denote its swiftness and rapid advance so abundantly fulfilled in the conquests of Alexander the Great. The four heads of the leopard predict the partition of this empire into the kingdoms of Syria, Egypt, Macedonia and Asia Minor. The fourth beast, the great nondescript, with its ten horns, and the little horn, still to come, is the Roman Empire. These are wonderful things. Be it remembered that the prophet received the vision when the Babylonian Empire still existed. Here also the character of these empires typified by ferocious beasts is revealed. The great nations of Christendom which

occupy the ground of the Roman Empire testify unconsciously to the truth of this great prophecy. The emblems of these nations are not doves, little lambs or other harmless creatures. They have chosen the lion, the bear, the unicorn, the eagle and the double-headed eagle.

ALEXANDER THE GREAT PREDICTED

In the eighth chapter a new prophecy is revealed through Daniel. Once more the Medo-Persian Empire is seen, this time under the figure of a ram with two horns, one higher than the other, and the higher one came up last. It foretells the composition of that empire. It was composed of the Medes and the Persians; the Persians came in last and were the strongest. It conquered in three directions. This corresponds to the bear with the three ribs in the previous chapter.

The he-goat which Daniel sees coming from the west with a great rush is the type of the leopard empire, the Graeco-Macedonian. The same swiftness as revealed in the leopard with four wings is seen here again. The notable horn upon the he-goat, symbolizing the Macedonian Empire, is Alexander the Great. Josephus tells us that Alexander was greatly moved when the Jewish high priest Jaddua acquainted him with the meaning of this prophecy written over two hundred years before. And how was it fulfilled, what is predicted in Dan. 8:5-8? 334 B. C. the notable horn, Alexander, in goat-like fashion, leaped across the Hellespont and fought successful battles, then pushed on to the banks of the Indus and the Nile and from there to Shushan. The great battles of the Granicus (334 B. C.), Issus (333 B. C.), and Arbella (331 B. C.) were fought, and with irresistible force he stamped the power of Persia and its king, Darius Codomannus, to the ground. He conquered rapidly Syria, Phoenicia, Cyprus, Pyre, Gaza, Egypt, Babylonia, Persia. In 329 he conquered Bactria, crossed the Oxus and Jaxaitis and defeated the Scythians. And thus he stamped upon the ram after having broken its horns. But

when the he-goat had waxed very great, the great horn was broken. This predicted the early and sudden death of Alexander the Great. He died after a reign of 12 years and eight months, after a career of drunkenness and debauchery in 323 B. C. He died when he was but 32 years old. Then four notable ones sprang up in the place of the broken horn. This too has been fulfilled, for the empire of Alexander was divided into four parts. Four of the great generals of Alexander made the division, namely, Cassander, Lysimachus, Seleucus and Ptolemy. The four great divisions were Syria, Egypt, Macedonia, and Asia Minor.

ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES

In verses 19 to 24 of the eighth chapter of Daniel the coming of a wicked leader, to spring out of one of the divisions of the Macedonian Empire and the vile work he was to do, is predicted. He was to work great havoc in the pleasant land, that is, Israel's land.

History does not leave us in doubt about the identity of this wicked king. He is the eighth king of the Seleucid dynasty, who took the Syrian throne and is known by the name of Antiochus Epiphanes, and bore also the name of Epimanes, i. e., "the Madman." He was the tyrant and oppressor of the Jews. His wicked deeds of oppression, blasphemy and sacrilege are fully described in the Book of the Maccabees. Long before he ever appeared Daniel saw him and his wicked work in his vision.

And all this has been fulfilled in Antiochus Epiphanes. When he had conquered Jerusalem he sacrificed a sow upon the altar of burnt offerings and sprinkled its broth over the entire building. He corrupted the youths of Jerusalem by introducing lewd practices; the feast of tabernacles he changed into the feast of Bacchus. He auctioned off the high-priesthood. All kinds of infamies were perpetrated by him and the most awful obscenity permitted and encouraged. All true

worship was forbidden, and idol worship introduced, especially that of Jupiter Olympus. The whole city and land was devastated and some 100,000 pious Jews were massacred. Such has been the remarkable fulfillment of this prophecy.

Even the duration of this time of trouble was revealed; and 2,300 days are mentioned. These 2,300 days cover about the period of time during which Antiochus Epiphanes did his wicked deeds. The chronology of these 2,300 days is interesting. Judas Maccabaeus cleansed (lit. justified) the sanctuary from the abomination about December 25, 165 B. C. Antiochus died a miserable death two years later. Going back 2,300 days from the time Judas the Maccabean cleansed the defiled temple, brings us to 171 B. C. when we find the record of Antiochus' interference with the Jews. Menelaus had bribed Antiochus to make him high priest, robbed the temple and instituted the murder of the high priest Onias III. The most wicked deeds in the defilement of the temple were perpetrated by the leading general of Antiochus, Apollonius, in the year 168 B. C. We believe these 2,300 days are therefore literal days and have found their literal fulfillment in the dreadful days of this wicked king from the North. There is no other meaning attached to these days and the foolish speculations that these days are years, etc., lack Scriptural foundation altogether.

THE GREATEST OF ALL

The greatest prophecy in the Book of Daniel is contained in the ninth chapter, the prophecy concerning the 70 weeks, transmitted from heaven through Gabriel. (Dan. 9:24-27.) To many readers of the Book of Daniel it is not quite clear what the expression "seventy weeks" means, and when it is stated that each week represents a period of seven years, many Christians do not know why such is the case. A brief word of explanation may therefore be in order. The literal translation of the term "seventy weeks" is "seventy sevens." Now this word "sevens" translated "weeks" may mean "days" and

it may mean "years." What then is meant here, seventy times seven days or seventy times seven years? It is evident that the "sevens" mean year weeks, seven years to each prophetic week. Daniel was occupied in reading the books and in prayer with the seventy years of the Babylonian captivity. And now Gabriel is going to reveal to him something which will take place in "seventy sevens," which means seventy times seven years. The proof that such is the case is furnished by the fulfillment of the prophecy itself.

First we notice in the prophecy that these 70 year-weeks are divided in three parts. Seven times seven (49 years) are to go by till the commanded rebuilding and restoration of Jerusalem should be accomplished. In the twentieth year of Artaxerxes the command was given to rebuild Jerusalem. It was in the year 445 B. C., exactly 49 years after the wall of Jerusalem and the city had been rebuilt. Then 62 weeks are given as the time when Messiah should be cut off and have nothing. This gives us 434 years (62 times 7). Here is a prediction concerning the death of Christ. Has it been fulfilled? Chronology shows that exactly 483 years after Artaxerxes gave the command to restore Jerusalem (445 B. C.), 434 years after the city had been restored, the death of our Lord Jesus Christ took place.

To be more exact, on the day on which our Lord Jesus Christ entered Jerusalem for the last time, the number of years announced by Gabriel expired and the Lord was crucified that week. The proof of it is perfect.

But there is more to be said. As a result of the cutting off of Messiah something else is prophesied. "And the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary." The prince that is to come (and is yet to come) is the little horn of Dan. 7. He arises out of the Roman Empire. The people of the prince that shall come are therefore the Roman people. They have fulfilled this prophecy by destroying the temple and the city.

THE WARS OF THE PTOLEMIES AND SELEUCIDAE

The greater part of the eleventh chapter in Daniel has been historically fulfilled. It is an interesting study. So accurate are the predictions that the enemies of the Bible have tried their very best to show that Daniel did not write these prophecies several hundred years before they occurred. But they have failed in their miserable attempts. We place the startling evidence before our readers.

PROPHECY GIVEN B. C. 534	FULFILLMENT
"And now will I shew thee the truth. Behold, there shall stand up yet three kings in Persia; and the fourth shall be far richer than they all: and by his strength through his riches he shall stir up all against the realm of Grecia." (Verse 2.)	See Ezra 4. 5-24. The three kings were: Ahasuerus, Artaxerxes and Darius, known in history as Cambyses, Pseudo Smerdis, and Darius Hystaspis (not Darius the Mede). The fourth one was Xerxes, who, as history tells us, was immensely rich. The invasion of Greece took place in 480 B. C.
"And a mighty king shall stand up, that shall rule with great dominion, and do according to his will." (Verse 3.)	The successors of Xerxes are not mentioned. The mighty king in this verse is the notable horn seen by Daniel on the he-goat in chapter 8, Alexander the Great, 335 B. C.
"And when he shall stand up, his kingdom shall be broken, and shall be divided toward the four winds of heaven; and not to his posterity, nor according to his dominion which he ruled: for his kingdom shall be plucked up even for others besides those." (Verse 4.)	B. C. 323. Alexander died young. The notable horn was broken. His kingdom was divided into four parts (four winds) after the battle of Ipsus 301 B. C. His posterity did not receive the kingdom, but his four generals, Ptolemy, Lysimachus, Seleucus Nicator and Cassander. Not one of these divisions reached to the glory of Alexander's dominion.
"And the king of the South shall be strong, and one of his	Asia and Greece are not followed but Syria and Egypt become

PROPHECY GIVEN B. C. 534	FULFILLMENT
princes; and he shall be strong above him, and have dominion; his dominion shall be a great dominion." (Verse 5.)	prominent, because the King of the North from Syria, and the King of the South, Egypt, were to come in touch with the Jews. The holy land became involved with both. The King of the South was Ptolemy Lagus. One of his princes was Seleucus Nicator. He established a great dominion, which extended to the Indus.
"And in the end of years they shall join themselves together; for the king's daughter of the South shall come to the King of the North to make an agreement; but she shall not retain the power of the arm; neither shall he stand, nor his arm: but she shall be given up, and they that brought her, and he that begat her, and he that strengthened her in these times." (Verse 6.)	Here is another gap. This verse takes us to 250 B. C. The two who make an alliance are the Kings of the North (Syrian division of the Grecian Empire) and of the South (Egypt). This alliance was effected by the marriage of the daughter of the King of the South, the Egyptian Princess Berenice, daughter of Ptolemy II., to Antiochus Theos, the King of the North. The agreement was that Antiochus had to divorce his wife and make any child of Berenice his heir in the kingdom. The agreement ended in calamity. When Ptolemy died Antiochus Theos in 247 called back his former wife. Berenice and her young son were poisoned and the first wife's son, Callinicus, was put on the throne as Seleucus II.
"But out of a branch of her roots shall one stand up in his estate, which shall come with an army, and shall enter into the fortress of the King of the North, and shall deal against them, and shall prevail." (Verse 7.)	The one out of her roots (Berenice, who had been murdered) was her own brother, Ptolemy Euergetes, who avenged her death. He conquered Syria. He dealt against Seleucus II, King of the North, and slew the wife of An-

PROPHECY GIVEN B. C. 534	FULFILLMENT
	tiochus Theos, who had Berenice poisoned. He seized the fortress, the port of Antioch.
"And shall also carry captives into Egypt their gods, with their princes, and with their precious vessels of silver and gold; and he shall continue more years than the King of the North." (Verse 8.)	Ptolemy Euergetes did exactly as predicted. He returned with 4,000 talents of gold and 40,000 talents of silver and 2,500 idols and idolatrous vessels. Many of these Cambyses had taken to Persia.
"So the King of the South shall come into his kingdom, and shall return into his own land." (Verse 9.) (*Literal translation*): "and the same [King of the North] shall come into the realm of the King of the South, but shall return into his own land."	In 240 B. C. Seleucus Callinicus the King of the North invaded Egypt. He had to return defeated. His fleet perished in a storm.
"But his sons shall be stirred up, and shall assemble a multitude of great forces; and one shall certainly come, and overflow, and pass through: then shall he return, and be stirred up, even to his fortress." (Verse 10.)	The sons of Seleucus Callinicus were Seleucus III and Antiochus the Great. Seleucus (Ceraunos) III began war against Egyptian Provinces in Asia Minor. He was unsuccessful. The other son Antioch invaded Egypt and passed through because Ptolemy Philopater did not oppose him. In 218 B. C. Antiochus continued his warfare and took the fortress Gaza.
"And the King of the South shall be moved with choler, and shall come forth and fight with him, even with the King of the North: and he shall set forth a great multitude but the multitude shall be given into his hand." (Verse 11.)	In 217 B. C. Ptolemy aroused himself and fought Antiochus the Great with an immense army. He defeated Antiochus. The multitude was given into the hands of Ptolemy Philopater.

PROPHECY GIVEN B. C. 534	FULFILLMENT
"And when he hath taken away the multitude, his heart shall be lifted up; and he shall cast down many ten thousands: but he shall not be strengthened by it." (Verse 12.) (*Literal:* "And the multitude shall rise up and his courage increase.")	The people of Egypt rose up and the weakling Ptolemy became courageous. His victory is again referred to. It was won at Raphia. He might have pressed his victory. But he did not make use of it but gave himself up to a licentious life. Thus "he was not strengthened by it."
"For the King of the North shall return, and shall set forth a multitude greater than the former, and shall certainly come after certain years with a great army and with much riches." (Verse 13.)	About 14 years later, 203 B. C., Antiochus assembled a great army, greater than the army which was defeated at Raphia, and turned against Egypt. Ptolemy Philopater had died and left an infant son Ptolemy Epiphanes.
"And in those times there shall many stand up against the King of the South: also the robbers of thy people shall exalt themselves to establish the vision; but they shall fall." (Verse 14.)	Antiochus had for his ally Philip, King of Macedon. Also in Egypt many rebels stood up. And then there were, as we read in Josephus, wicked Jews, who helped Antiochus. These "robbers of thy people" established the vision. They helped along the very things which had been predicted, as to trials for them.
"So the King of the North shall come, and cast up a mount, and take the most fenced cities: and the arms of the South shall not withstand, neither his chosen people, neither shall there be any strength to withstand." (Verse 15.)	All this was fulfilled in the severe struggles, which followed.
"But he that cometh against him shall do according to his own will, and none shall stand before him: and he shall stand in the	The invasion of the glorious land by Antiochus followed. He subjected the whole land unto himself. He also was well dis-

PROPHECY GIVEN B. C. 534	FULFILLMENT
glorious land, which by his hand shall be consumed." (Verse 16.)	posed towards the Jews because they sided with Antiochus the Great against Ptolemy Epiphanes.
"He shall also set his face to enter with the strength of his whole kingdom, and an agreement shall be made with him; thus shall he do: and he shall give him the daughter of women, corrupting her: but she shall not stand on his side, neither be for him." (Verse 17.)	This brings us to the years 198-195 B. C. Antiochus aimed to get full possession of Egypt. An agreement was made. In this treaty between Antiochus and Ptolemy Epiphanes, Cleopatra, daughter of Antiochus was espoused to Ptolemy. Why is Cleopatra called "daughter of women?" Because she was very young and was under the care of her mother and grandmother. The treaty failed.
"After this shall he turn his face unto the isles, and shall take many: but a prince [literally: Captain] for his own behalf shall cause the reproach offered by him to cease; without his own reproach he shall cause it to turn upon him." (Verse 18.)	A few years later Antiochus conquered isles on the coast of Asia Minor. The captain predicted is Scipio Asiaticus. Antiochus had reproached the Romans by his acts and he was defeated. This defeat took place at Magnesia 190 B. C.
"Then he shall turn his face toward the fort of his own land: but he shall stumble and fall, and not be found." (Verse 19.)	Antiochus returns to his own land. He came to a miserable end trying to plunder the temple of Belus in Elymais.
"Then shall stand up in his estate a raiser of taxes in the glory of the kingdom: but within few days he shall be destroyed, neither in anger, nor in battle." (Verse 20.)	This is Seleucus Philopater B. C. 187-176. He was known as a raiser of taxes. He had an evil reputation with the Jews because he was such an exactor among them. His tax-collector Heliodorus poisoned him and so he was slain "neither in anger, nor in battle."

PROPHECY GIVEN B. C. 534	FULFILLMENT
"And in his estate shall stand up a vile person, to whom they shall not give the honor of the kingdom: but he shall come in peaceably, and obtain the kingdom by flatteries." (Verse 21.)	This vile person is none other than Antiochus Epiphanes. He had no claim on royal dignities, being only a younger son of Antiochus the Great. He seized royal honors by trickery and with flatteries. He is the little horn of chapter 8.
"And with the arms of a flood shall they be overflown from before him, and shall be broken; yea, also the prince of the covenant." (Verse 22.)	He was successful in defeating his enemies. The prince of the covenant may mean his nephew Ptolemy Philometor. He also vanquished Philometor's generals.
"And after the league made with him he shall work deceitfully: for he shall come up, and shall become strong with a small people." (Verse 23.)	He feigned friendship to young Ptolemy but worked deceitfully. To allay suspicion he came against Egypt with a small force but took Egypt as far as Memphis.
"He shall enter peaceably even upon the fattest places of the province; and he shall do that which his fathers have not done, nor his father's father; he shall scatter among them the prey, and spoil, and riches: yea, and he shall forecast his devices against the strongholds, even for a time." (Verse 24.)	He took possession of the fertile places in Egypt under the pretense of peace. He took Pelusium and laid seige to the fortified places Naucratis and Alexandria.
"And he shall stir up his power and his courage against the King of the South with a great army; and the King of the South shall be stirred up to battle with a very great and mighty army; but he shall not stand: for they shall forecast devices against him." (Verse 25.)	This King of the South is Ptolemy Physcon, who was made king after Philometor had fallen into the hands of Antiochus. He had a great army but did not succeed, because treason had broken out in his own camp.

PROPHECY GIVEN B. C. 534	FULFILLMENT
"Yea, they that feed of the portion of his meat shall destroy him, and his army shall overflow: and many shall fall down slain." (Verse 26.)	Additional actions of Antiochus and warfare, in which he was successful, followed.
"And both these kings' hearts shall be to do mischief, and they shall speak lies at one table; but it shall not prosper: for yet the end shall be at the time appointed." (Verse 27.)	The two kings are Antiochus Epiphanes and his associate Philometor. They made an alliance against Ptolemy Euergetes II, also called Physcon. But they spoke lies against each other and did not succeed in their plans.
"Then shall he return into his land with great riches; and his heart shall be against the holy covenant; and he shall do exploits, and return to his own land." (Verse 28.)	In 168 B. C. he returned from his expedition and had great riches. Then he marched through Judea and did his awful deeds. A report had come to his ears that the Jewish people had reported him dead. In the first and second book of the Maccabees we read of his atrocities. Then he retired to Antioch.
"At the time appointed he shall return, and come toward the South; but it shall not be as the former, or as the latter." (Verse 29.)	He made still another attempt against the South. However, he had not the former success.
"For the ships of Chittim shall come against him; therefore he shall be grieved, and return, and have indignation against the holy covenant: so shall he do; he shall even return, and have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant." (Verse 30.)	The ships of Chittim are the Roman fleet. When within a few miles of Alexandria he heard that ships had arrived. He went to salute them. They delivered to him the letters of the senate, in which he was commanded, on pain of the displeasure of the Roman people, to put an end to the war against his nephews. Antiochus said, "he would go and consult his

PROPHECY GIVEN B. C. 534	FULFILLMENT
	friends;" on which Popilius, one of the legates, took his staff, and instantly drew a circle round Antiochus on the sand, where he stood; and commanded him not to pass that circle, till he had given a definite answer. As a grieved and defeated man he returned and then he fell upon Judea once more to commit additional wickedness. Apostate Jews sided with him.
"And arms shall stand on his part and they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily sacrifice, and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate." (Verse 31.)	This brings us to the climax of the horrors under Antiochus Epiphanes. The previous record of it is contained in chapter 8. He sent Apollonius with over 20,000 men to destroy Jerusalem. Multitudes were slain, and women and children led away as captives. He issued a command that all people must conform to the idolatry of Greece. A wicked Grecian was sent to enforce the word of Antiochus. All sacrifices ceased and the God-given ceremonials of Judaism came to an end. The temple was polluted by the sacrifices of swine's flesh. The temple was dedicated to Jupiter Olympius. Thus the prediction was fulfilled.
"And such as do wickedly against the covenant shall he corrupt by flatteries: but the people that do know their God shall be strong, and do exploits. "And they that understand among the people shall instruct	These verses describe the condition among the Jewish people. There were two classes. Those who did wickedly against the covenant, the apostate, and those who knew God, a faithful remnant. The apostates sided with

PROPHECY GIVEN B. C. 534	FULFILLMENT
many: yet they shall fall by the sword, and by flame, by captivity, and by spoil, many days. "Now when they shall fall, they shall be holpen with a little help: but many shall cleave to them with flatteries." (Verses 32-34.)	the enemy, and the people who knew God were strong. This has reference to the noble Maccabees. There was also suffering and persecution.

MANY MORE FULFILLED PROPHECIES

Many other fulfilled prophecies might be quoted. In the last chapter of Daniel an interesting prediction is made concerning the time of the end. "Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased." Sir Isaac Newton, the discoverer of the law of gravitation, wrote on Daniel and expressed his belief that some day people would travel at the rate of fifty miles an hour. The French infidel Voltaire many years later laughed at Newton's statement and held it up to ridicule. The time of the end is here and the prophecy of Dan. 12:4 has come true.

In the New Testament are also written prophecies which are now in process of fulfillment. 1 Tim. 4:1, 2; 2 Tim. 3:1-5; 4:1-3; 2 Pet. 2; Jude's Epistle, and other Scriptures predict the present day apostasy.

UNFULFILLED PROPHECY

As stated before, there are many unfulfilled prophecies in the Bible. The literal fulfillment of prophecies in the past vouches for the literal fulfillment of every prophecy in the Word of God. Some of them were uttered several thousand years ago. The world still waits for their fulfillment. May we remember that God does not need to be in a hurry. He knows indeed the end from the beginning. He takes His time in accomplishing His eternal purposes. And may we, His people, who know and love His Word, not neglect prophecy, for the Prophetic Word is the lamp which shineth in a dark place.

CHAPTER VII

LIFE IN THE WORD

BY PHILIP MAURO, ATTORNEY AT LAW, NEW YORK CITY

INTRODUCTION

It must be evident to all who pay close attention to the spiritual conditions of our day that there is being made at this time a very determined and widespread effort to set aside entirely the *authority* of the Bible. Let us note that one of the unique characteristics of that Book is that it claims the right to control the actions of men. It speaks "as one *having* authority." It assumes, and in the most peremptory and uncompromising way, to rebuke men for misconduct, and to tell them what they shall do and what they shall not do. It speaks to men, not as from the human plane, or even from the standpoint of superior human wisdom and morality; but as from a plane far above the highest human level, and as with a wisdom which admits of no question or dispute from men. It demands throughout unqualified submission.

But this assumption of control over men is a direct obstacle to the democratic spirit of the times, which brooks no authority higher than that of "the people," that is to say, of Man himself. To establish and to make universal the principles of pure democracy is the object, whether consciously or unconsciously, of the great thought-movements of our era; and the essence and marrow of democracy is the supreme authority of Man. Hence the conflict with the Bible.

Not only is the Bible, with its peremptory assertion of supremacy and control over mankind, directly counter to the democratic movement, but it is now the *only* real obstacle to

(Copyrighted by the Fleming H. Revell Company, and published herewith by permission.)

the complete independence of humanity. If only the authority of the Scriptures be gotten rid of, mankind will have attained the long-coveted state of absolute independence, which is equivalent to utter lawlessness.

The state of ideal democracy would be accurately described as "lawlessness," since it is manifest that an individual or a society which is under no restraint except such as is self-imposed, is really under no restraint at all. To attain this ideal state is the end and purpose of present day movements; and, in order to promote these movements, that mighty spiritual intelligence who is designated "the spirit that now works in the children of disobedience" (Eph. 2:2) very wisely, and with consummate subtlety, directs the attack, from many different quarters, against the authority of the Bible.

The great mass of men, including the majority of the leaders of the age, are already completely absorbed in the activities of the world and utterly indifferent to the claims of the Bible. As to these, it is only necessary to take care that they are not aroused from their indifference. But the Bible nevertheless, by reason of its hold upon the consciences of the few, exerts, upon society as a whole, a mighty restraining influence, against which the assaults of the enemies of truth are now being directed.

In some quarters the authority of the Bible is directly assailed and its Divine origin disputed in the name of "Science" and of "Scholarship." Much of the learning and theological activity of the day are concentrated upon the attempt to discredit the Bible, and to disseminate views and theories directly at variance with its claims of divine inspiration and authority.

In other quarters the attack takes the form of a pretense of conceding the inspiration of the Bible, coupled with the claim that other writers and other great literary works were equally inspired. "God is not limited," we are told, "and can speak to man, and does speak to man, in our day, in like manner as in the days of Moses, Isaiah, or Paul."

Manifestly it makes practically no difference whether the Bible be dragged down to the level of other books, or other books be exalted to the level of the Bible. The result is the same in both cases; namely, that the unique authority of the Bible is set aside.

But even in quarters where the Divine origin of the Bible is fully recognized, the enemy is actively at work with a view to weakening its influence. There is much teaching abroad (heard usually in connection with certain spiritual manifestations which have become quite common of late) to the effect that those who have the Spirit dwelling in them, and speaking directly to and through them, are independent of the Word of God. This is the form which the idea of a continuing revelation takes in quarters where a direct attack on the authority of Scripture would fail. But the result is the same.

In such a state of things it is manifestly of the very highest importance to insist unceasingly upon the sufficiency, finality and completeness of the Revelation given by God in His Word. With the desire to serve this purpose, even though it be in a very small degree, these pages are written. It would be, however, a task far beyond the capacity of the writer to present all the unique characteristics of the Bible, whereby it is so distinguished from other books that it occupies a class by itself. The writer has, therefore, singled out for consideration one special attribute or characteristic of the Holy Scriptures; namely, that signified by the word "living."

If one is able to apprehend, however feebly, the tremendous fact that the Word of God is a LIVING Word, such knowledge will go far towards affording him protection from what is perhaps the greatest danger of these "perilous times."

I. THE INCARNATE WORD, AND THE WRITTEN WORD: BOTH ARE "LIVING"

Of the many statements which the Bible makes concerning the Word of God, none is more significant, and surely none is

of greater importance to dying men, than the statement that the Word of God is a LIVING Word.

In Philippians 2:16 we have the expression, "The Word of Life." The same expression occurs in 1 John 1:1. It is here used of Jesus Christ, the Incarnate Word, whereas in Philippians it is apparently the Written Word that is spoken of. The Written Word and the Incarnate Word are so identified in Scripture that it is not always clear which is referred to. The same things are said of each, and the same characters attributed to each. The fundamental resemblance lies in the fact that each is the revealer or tangible expression of the Invisible God. As the written or spoken word expresses, for the purpose of communicating to another, the invisible and inaccessible thought, so Jesus Christ as the Incarnate Word, and the Holy Scriptures as the Written Word, express and communicate knowledge of the invisible and inaccessible God. "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." "Believe Me that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me" (John 14:9,11).

In Hebrews 4:12 we find the statement that "The Word of God is LIVING and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword" (R. V.). Clearly this refers to the Written Word. But the very next verse, without any change of subject, directs our attention to the Searcher of hearts (Rev. 2:23), saying, "Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in His sight: but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of Him with whom we have to do."

Again in 1 Peter 1:23 we read of "the Word of God which liveth," or more literally, "the Word of God living." Here again there might be uncertainty as to whether the Incarnate Word or the Written Word be meant; but it is generally understood that the latter is in view, and the quotation from Isaiah 40:6-8 would confirm this idea.

From these passages we learn that the Word of God is spoken of as a "living" Word. This is a very remarkable

statement, and is worthy of our closest examination and most earnest consideration. Why is the Word of God thus spoken of? Why is the extraordinary property of LIFE, or vitality, attributed to it? In what respects can it be said to be a living Word?

But the expression "living," as applied to the Word of God, manifestly means something more than partaking of the kind of life with which we are acquainted from observation. God speaks of Himself as the "Living God." The Lord Jesus is the "Prince of Life." (Acts 3:15.) He announced Himself to John in the vision of Patmos as "He that liveth." Eternal life is in Him. (1 John 5:11.)

It is clear, then, that when we read, "The Word of God is living," we are to understand thereby that it lives with a spiritual, an inexhaustible, an inextinguishable, in a word a divine, life. If the Word of God be indeed living in this sense, then we have here a fact of the most tremendous significance. In the world around us the beings and things which we call "living" may just as appropriately be spoken of as "dying." What we call "the land of the living" might better be described as the land of the dying. Wherever we look we see that death is in possession, and is working according to its invariable method of corruption and decay. Death is the real monarch of this world, and we meet at every turn the gruesome evidence and results of the universal sway of him who has "the power of death, that is, the devil" (Heb. 2:14). "Death reigned" (Rom. 5:17), and still reigns over everything. The mighty and awful power of death has made this earth of ours a great burying ground—a gigantic cemetery.

Can it be that there is an exception to this apparently universal rule? Is there, indeed, in this world of dying beings, where the forces of corruption fasten immediately upon everything into which life has entered, and upon all the works of so-called living creatures, one object which is really LIVING, an object upon which corruption cannot fasten

itself, and which resists and defies all the power of death? Such is the assertion of the passages of Scripture which we have quoted. Surely, then, if these statements be true, we have here the most astounding phenomenon in all the accessible universe; and it will be well worth while to investigate an object of which so startling an assertion is seriously, if very unobtrusively, made.

Before we proceed with our inquiry let us note one of many points of resemblance between the Incarnate Word and the Written Word. When "the Word was made flesh and dwelt [tabernacled] among us" (John 1:14), there was nothing in His appearance to manifest His Deity, or to show that "in Him was life" (John 1:4). That fact was demonstrated, not by His blameless and unselfish behavior, nor by His incomparable teachings and discourses, but by His *resurrection from the dead*. The only power which is greater than that of death is the power of life. He had, and exercised, that power, and holds now the keys of death and of hades. (Rev. 1:18, R. V.)

Similarly, there is nothing in the appearance and behavior (so to speak) of the Bible to show that it has a characteristic, even divine life, which other books have not. It bears the same resemblance to other writings that Jesus, the son of Mary, bore to other men. It is given in human language just as He came in human flesh. Yet there is between it and all other books the same difference as between Him and all other men, namely, the difference *between the living and the dying*. "The word of God is living."

It will require, therefore, something more than a hasty glance or a casual inspection to discern this wonderful difference; but the difference is there, and with diligence and attention we may discover some clear indications of it.

II. NO DEFINITIONS OF LIFE

Man's wisdom and learning are incapable of furnishing a definition of life. The attempts of the wisest and most learned

to furnish such a definition only serve to exhibit the futility of the attempt.

Herbert Spencer, who has made the most ambitious attempt of modern times to explain the visible universe, gives this as the result of his best efforts to define life: "Life is the continuous adjustment of internal relations to external relations."

This definition manifestly stands as much in need of explanation as that which it purports to explain. But it will serve at least to remind us that the wisdom of men is foolishness with God.

Another eminent man of science defined life as "the twofold internal movement of composition and decomposition, at once general and continuous."

These modern definitions are scarcely an improvement upon that of Aristotle, who defined life as "the assemblage of the operations of nutrition, growth, and destruction."

What a marvellous thing is life, and how far it transcends the comprehension of man, since his best efforts to define it give results so ridiculously inadequate!

The ignorance of scientific men on this subject is frankly confessed by Alfred Russell Wallace, who in one of his latest books, "Man's Place in the Universe," says, "Most people give scientific men credit for much greater knowledge than they possess in these matters." And again: "As to the deeper problems of life, and growth, and reproduction, though our physiologists have learned an infinite amount of curious and instructive facts, they can give us *no intelligible* explanation of them."

But, if none of us can say what life is, we can all distinguish between that which is living (even in the ordinary sense of the word) and that which is not living; and our best idea of the meaning of life is obtained by comparing that which has life (whether animal or vegetable) with that which has not life, as minerals, or any non-living matter. We know that between

the two there is a great gulf, which only divine power can span; for it is only the living God who can impart life to that which is lifeless.

We look then at the Written Word of God to see if it manifests characteristics which are found only in living things, and to see if it exhibits, not merely the possession of life of the perishable and corruptible sort with which we are so familiar by observation, and which is in each of us, but life of a different order, imperishable and incorruptible.

III. PERENNIAL FRESHNESS

The Bible differs radically from all other books in its perpetual freshness. This characteristic will be recognized only by those who know the Book in that intimate way which comes from living with it, as with a member of one's family. I mention it first because it was one of the first *unique* properties of the Bible which impressed me after I began to read it as a believer in Christ. It is a very remarkable fact that the Bible never becomes exhausted, never acquires sameness, never diminishes in its power of responsiveness to the quickened soul who comes to it. The most familiar passages yield as much (if not more) refreshment at the thousandth perusal, as at the first. It is indeed as a fountain of living water. The fountain is the same, but the water is always fresh, and always refreshing. We can compare this to nothing but what we find in a living companion, whom we love and to whom we go for help and fellowship. The person is always the same, and yet without sameness. New conditions evoke new responses; and so it is with the Bible. As a living Book it adapts itself to the new phases of our experience and the new conditions in which we find ourselves. From the most familiar passage there comes again and again *a new message;* just as our most familiar friend or companion will have something new to say, as changed conditions and new situations require it from time to time.

This is true of no other book. What man's book has to say we can get the first time; and the exceptions arise merely from lack of clearness on the writer's part, or lack of apprehension on the part of the reader. Man can touch only the surface of things, and he cares only about surface appearances. So, in all his writings, whatever substance they contain lies on the surface, and can be gathered by a capable reader at once. If the Word of God may be compared in this particular to a living person, the books of men may be compared to pictures or statues of living persons. However beautifully or artistically executed, a single view may readily exhaust the latter, and a second and third look will be mere repetitions. The difference is that which exists between the living and the dead. The Word of God is LIVING.

But while the Bible resembles in this important respect a living person, who is our familiar, sympathetic, and responsive companion, it differs from such a human companion in that the counsel, comfort, and support it furnishes are far above and beyond what any human being can supply; and the only explanation of this is that the source of its life and powers is not human, but Divine.

IV. THE BIBLE DOES NOT BECOME OBSOLETE

One of the most prominent characteristics of books written by men for the purpose of imparting information and instruction is that they very quickly become obsolete, and must be cast aside and replaced by others. This is particularly true of books on science, text-books, school-books and the like. Indeed it is a matter of boasting (though it would be hard to explain why) that "progress" is so rapid in all departments of learning as to render the scientific books of one generation almost worthless to the next. Changes in human knowledge, thought and opinion occur so swiftly, that books, which were the standards yesterday, are set aside today for others, which in turn will be discarded for yet other "authorities" tomorrow. In fact, every

book which is written for a serious purpose begins to become obsolete before the ink is dry on the page. This may be made the occasion of boasting of the great progess of humanity, and of the wonderful advances of "science;" but the true significance of the fact is that man's books are all, like himself, dying creatures.

The Bible, on the other hand, although it treats of the greatest and most serious of all subjects, such as God, Christ, eternity, life, death, sin, righteousness, judgment, redemption—is always the latest, best, and *only* authority on all these and other weighty matters whereof it treats. Centuries of "progress" and "advancement" have added *absolutely nothing* to the sum of knowledge on any of these subjects. The Bible is always fresh and thoroughly "up to date." Indeed it is far, far ahead of human science. Progress cannot overtake it, or get beyond it. Generation succeeds generation, but each finds the Bible waiting for it with its ever fresh and never failing stores of information touching matters of the highest concern, touching *everything* that affects the welfare of human beings.

V. SCIENCE AND THE BIBLE

Human teachers and teachings have, indeed, frequently set themselves in opposition to some of the statements of the Bible; and it has often been announced, upon human authority, that errors in history and in matters of science have been detected in the Bible. Some, indeed, have endeavored to save the reputation and authority of the Bible by saying that it was not written to teach men "science." In a sense this is true. The Bible was not written to impart that kind of knowledge which "puffeth up," but just the contrary. It was written to impart that kind of information which takes man down by showing him his true position as a ruined, perishing creature, under the condemnation and power of death, and utterly "without strength," that is to say, incapable of doing *anything* to deliver himself out of this deplorable condition. It declares that, "if any man

think that he knoweth *anything,* he knoweth *nothing* yet as he ought to know" (1 Cor. 8:2). Such is the plain declaration of Scripture as to the limitations of all human knowledge; and he who knows the most is most conscious of these limitations. But if, by the statement that the Bible was not written to teach "science," it be meant that the Bible is unscientific, that statement is not true. On the contrary, the Bible is the only book in the world that is truly "scientific;" for it is the only book which gives precise, accurate and *absolutely reliable* information upon every subject whereof it treats. It is the only book in the world upon *every* statement of which one may safely put implicit confidence. Countless millions have believed the statements of the Word of God, every one of them to his unspeakable advantage, not one of them to his hurt.

We used to hear a great deal, some thirty years ago, about the many "mistakes of Moses," and the errors which "science," with her keen eye, had detected in the Scriptures. But we hear very little today from scientists themselves about the "conflicts between science and religion." These conflicts have, one by one, ceased, as "science" has revised her hasty conclusions and corrected her blunders. The writer has been a diligent student of the physical sciences and of the philosophies based on them, for upwards of twenty-five years, and a practicing lawyer for a still longer period, and having now acquired a fair knowledge of the text of Scripture, he can say that he is aware of no demonstrated fact of science which is in conflict with a single statement of the Bible. Among all the "assured results of science" there exists not, to his knowledge, evidence sufficient in character and amount to convict the Bible of a single error or misstatement. Of course, such evidence could not exist. The Lord Jesus said of the Word of God, "Thy Word is truth" (John 17:17); and of course, true knowledge of God's creation cannot conflict with His Word.

A recent book by Alfred Russel Wallace entitled, "Man's Place in the Universe" (1904), furnishes a striking illustration,

on a large scale, of the way in which "science," after leading the thought of cultured and highly educated minds away from the truth revealed by Scripture, sometimes leads it back again.

The reading of Scripture undoubtedly gives, and was clearly intended to give, the impression that the earth is the center of interest in the universe, and the object of the Creator's special care; that it was fitted with elaborate pains to be the habitation of living creatures, and especially of man; and that the sun, moon and stars were created with special reference to their service to the earth. Hence, for many centuries, man believed that the earth was the center of the universe, and (though the Bible does not say so) that the sun and stars were relatively small bodies which moved around and waited upon it.

But these ideas have been completely upset by the discoveries of modern astronomers, who ascertained, at least to their entire satisfaction, that not only is the sun enormously larger than the earth, but that it is attended by other planets, the largest of which is twelve hundred times larger than the earth. Moreover, it has also been learned, so we are told, that our sun itself is but one of an almost infinite number of stars, many of which are immensely greater in size, and which, it may be assumed, are themselves the centers of planetary systems on a much grander scale than our little solar system.

In such a universe as modern astronomy has brought into the view of man our little earth, once thought to be its center of interest and importance, shrinks into utter insignificance. In proportion to the vast universe of which it is a member its size is relatively less than that of a tiny particle of dust in proportion to the mass of the earth itself. How, therefore, can it be supposed that the Creator of so inconceivably great and complex a universe would have a special regard for this insignificant attendant of a fourth-rate sun, and for the still more insignificant creatures who dwell upon it? The earth with all its occupants could drop out of the universe and be no

more missed than a single grain of sand from the seashore or a single drop of water from the ocean.

It is inevitable that these teachings of astronomy concerning the universe should have produced impressions directly opposite to those produced by Scripture, and should have placed obstacles in the way of believing the doctrine of redemption by the incarnation and sacrificial death of the Son of God.

But now comes Mr. Wallace, the contemporary of Charles Darwin, and probably at the present day one of the most prominent men of science, and reverses the ideas which have been so widely disseminated in the name of science. Mr. Wallace masses a great body of evidence, derived both from astronomy and physics, to support the propositions, First, that the solar system occupies (and always has occupied) approximately the central portion of this vast universe, getting all the advantages due to such favorable position; Second, that the earth is certainly the only habitable planet in the solar system, and presumably the only habitable spot in the whole universe. Mr. Wallace, by a vast accumulation of facts and inferences, shows that the physical conditions necessary for the maintenance of life depend upon a great variety of complex and delicate adjustments, such as distance from the sun, the mass of the planet, its obliquity to its orbit, the amount of water as compared with land, the surface distribution of land and water, the permanence of this distribution, the density of the earth, the volume and density of the atmosphere, the amount of carbon-dioxide therein, etc. These, and other essential conditions, are met (says Mr. Wallace) only in a planet such as this earth, situated and constructed as it is. From Mr. Wallace's premises, if the universe is assumed to be the work of an intelligent Creator, it would follow that everything in this inconceivably vast and complex universe has been planned and arranged with special reference to making this little earth of ours a place suitable for the habitation of living beings, and especially of mankind.

We give Mr. Wallace's conclusions in his own words. He

says: *"This completes my work as a connected argument, founded wholly upon the facts and principles accumulated by modern science; and it leads, if my facts are substantially correct and my reasoning sound, to one great and definite conclusion,—that man, the culmination of conscious organic life, has been developed HERE ONLY in the whole vast material universe we see around us."*

Thus we have the surprising fact that one of the foremost living exponents of the teachings of science, a man who certainly attaches no importance to the teachings of Scripture, has been at great pains to show that the earth is, after all, the center of, and most important place in, the whole universe; and that, so far as any purpose can be detected in it, the universe may well be supposed to exist for the sole benefit of the earth, and for the sake of producing therein those peculiar conditions necessary for the existence and maintenance of life.

We may say then that, considered merely as a book of instruction, the Bible is, as to every subject whereof it treats, not merely abreast of, but far ahead of, the learning of these and all other times, whether past or future. The impressions it makes upon believing minds are the impressions of *truth*, even though (as in the instance we have just been considering) contemporary science may give, as its settled conclusions, impressions directly to the contrary.

Unlike other books of instruction THE BIBLE DOES NOT BECOME OBSOLETE. This is a fact of immense significance; and its only explanation is that the Bible is a LIVING book, the Word of the living God. All other books partake of the infirmity of their authors, and are either dying or dead. On the other hand, "The Word of God is living."

VI. THE BIBLE IS INDESTRUCTIBLE

The Bible manifests the possession of inherent and imperishable life in that it survives all the attempts that have been made to destroy it.

The Bible is the only book in the world that is truly hated. The hatred it arouses is bitter, persistent, murderous. From generation to generation this hatred has been kept alive. There is doubtless a supernatural explanation for this continuous display of hostility towards the Word of God, for that Word has a supernatural enemy who has personally experienced its power. (Matt, 4:1-10.)

But the natural explanation of this hatred is that the Bible differs notably from other books in that it gives no flattering picture of man and his world, but just the reverse. The Bible does not say that man is a noble being, ever aspiring towards the attainment of exalted ideals. It does not describe the career of humanity as "progress," as the brave and successful struggle of man against the evils of his environment; but quite the contrary, declares it to be a career of disobedience and departure from God, a preference for darkness rather than for light, "because their deeds are evil."

The Bible does not represent man as having come, without any fault of his own, into adverse circumstances, and as being engaged in gradually overcoming these by the development and exercise of his inherent powers. It does not applaud his achievements, and extol his wonderful civilization. Quite the contrary. It records how God saw that the *wickedness* of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. (Gen. 6:5.) It speaks of man as "being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness, full of envy, murder, strife, guile, evil dispositions; whisperers, slanderers, hateful to God, insolent, proud, vaunting, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, perfidious, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful" (Rom. 1:29-31 Gr.). It says that "They are *all* under sin," that "There is none righteous, no not one. There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable;

there is none that doeth good, no not one" (Rom. 3:10-12). Man's condition by nature is described as "*dead* in trespasses and sins," "children of disobedience; among whom also we *all* had our conduct in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were *by nature* the children of wrath" (Eph. 2:1-3).

The Bible has nothing to say in praise of man or of his natural endowments. On the contrary, it derides his wisdom as "foolishness with God." It declares that God has made foolish the wisdom of this age (1 Cor. 1:20); that the natural man is incapable of receiving the things of the Spirit of God (1 Cor. 2:14); and that if any man thinks that he knows anything, he knows nothing yet as he ought to know. (1 Cor. 8:2.)

Nor does the Bible predict the ultimate triumph of "civilization." It does not say that the progress of humanity shall bring it eventually to a vastly better state of things. It does not say that human nature shall improve under the influences of education and self-culture, even with that of Christianity added. On the contrary, it declares that evil men "shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived" (2 Tim. 3:13).

Even of "this present evil age" (Gal. 1:4), during which the professing church is the most conspicuous object on earth, and during which the world has the enormous benefit resulting from the light of revelation and an open Bible, it is not predicted that man and his world would undergo any improvement, or that the developments of the age would be in the direction of better conditions on earth. On the contrary, the Bible declares that "in the last days perilous [or difficult] times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, lovers of money, vaunting, proud, evil speakers, disobedient to parents, untruthful, unholy, without natural affection, implacable, slanderers, inconsistent, savage, not lovers of good, betrayers, headstrong, puffed up, lovers of pleasure rather than

lovers of God; having a form of piety, but denying the power of it" (2 Tim. 3:1-5 Gr.).

Such is the character of man, and such is to be the result, as Scripture foretells it, of all his schemes of betterment, education, development, self-culture, civilization and character-building. And because of this the Bible is heartily detested. Men have sought nothing more earnestly than they have sought to destroy this appallingly accurate portrait of themselves and their doings. How astonishing it is that any intelligent person should suppose that man drew this picture of himself, and predicted this as the outcome of all his own efforts! No wonder the Bible is hated, and for the simple and sufficient reason that it declares the truth about man and his world. The Lord Jesus set forth clearly both the fact and its explanation when He said to His unbelieving brethren, "The world cannot hate you; but Me it hateth, because I testify of it that *the works thereof are evil*" (John 7:7).

Again, the Bible is hated because it claims the right to exercise, and assumes to exercise, *authority over man*. It speaks as one *having authority*. It issues commands to all. It says, "Thou shalt" and "Thou shalt not." It does not simply advise or commend one course of action rather than another, as one would address an equal, but it directs men imperatively what they shall do, and what they shall not do. In this manner it addresses all ranks and conditions of men—kings and governors, parents and children, husbands and wives, masters and servants, rich and poor, high and low, free and bond. In this, too, we have a characteristic of the Bible which distinguishes it from all other books. It is no respecter of persons. But for this cause also it is hated; for men are becoming more and more impatient of all external authority. The principles of democracy, the essence of which is the supremacy (virtually the *divinity*) of man, has thoroughly leavened all society in the progressive nations of the earth. There is a sentiment

abroad, which finds frequent expression and meets always with a sympathetic reception, to the effect that man has been shackled through the ages by narrow theological ideas whereof the Bible is the source, and that the time has arrived for him to throw off this bondage, to arise in his true might and majesty, and to do great things for himself.

It is a most impressive fact that, in all the visible universe, there is nothing that assumes authority over man, or that imposes laws upon him, *except the Bible*. Once thoroughly rid of that troublesome book, and man will be finally rid of all authority, and will have arrived at that state of lawlessness predicted in the New Testament prophecies, wherein society will be ready to accept the leadership of that "lawless one," whose coming is to be after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and wonders of falsehood, and with all deceit of unrighteousness in them that perish, because they received not a love of the truth that they might be saved. (2 Thess. 2:7-10.)

This is perhaps the main purpose of the persistent attempts in our day, mostly in the name of scholarship and liberal theology, to break down the authority of Scripture; and we may see with our own eyes that the measure of success of this great apostasy is just what the Bible has foretold.

Other books arouse no hatred. There may be books which men dislike, and such they simply let alone But the Bible is, and always has been, hated to the death. It is the *one book* that has been pursued from century to century, as men pursue a mortal foe. At first its destruction has been sought by violence. All human powers, political and ecclesiastical, have combined to put it out of existence. Death has been the penalty for possessing or reading a copy; and such copies as were found have been turned over to the public executioner to be treated as was the Incarnate Word. No expedient that human ingenuity could devise or human cruelty put into effect, has been omitted in the desperate attempt to put this detested

book out of existence. But the concentrated power of man utterly failed in the attempt. Why?

Here is one book among countless millions which is singled out for relentless hatred, and that fact alone is sufficient to provoke astonishment and invite the closest scrutiny to ascertain the explanation of the unique phenomenon. What characteristic is it that distinguishes this Book from all other books in so strange a fashion? Has its influence upon men been corrupting or otherwise evil? Does it teach doctrines dangerous to individuals or communities? Does it promote disorder, vice or crime? On the contrary, it will not be questioned that its influence, wherever it has gone, has been beneficial beyond that of all other books combined, and that the most fruitful human lives are those which have been moulded by its teachings. One explanation alone will account for the astounding fact that such a Book should be the only one now or ever in existence to provoke active and persistent animosity among men who refuse to acknowledge it as from God; namely, that it declares man to be a *fallen* creature, and his whole career to be the mere outworking of his corrupt nature in the path of disobedience; and that it predicts in plain language what the end of that path will be for all who do not accept God's method of deliverance out of it through Jesus Christ.

But, violence having failed to rid man of the Bible, other means have been resorted to in the persistent effort to accomplish that object. To this end the intellect and learning of man have been enlisted. The Book has been assailed from every side by men of the highest intelligence, culture and scholarship. Since the art of printing has been developed there has been in progress a continuous war of books. Many books against THE Book—man's books against God's Book. Its authority has been denied, and its veracity and even its morality have been impugned, its claims upon the consciences of men have been ridiculed; but all to no purpose, except to

bring out more conspicuously the fact that the "Word of God is LIVING," and with an indestructible life.

Should any other book incur the hatred of man (which no other book ever has, seeing that all others are man's own productions) it would not be necessary to take measures for its destruction. A book produced by dying men need only be let alone to die of its own accord. The seeds of death are in it from the start. One Book alone has incurred man's hatred, because it is the one Book that is not his own. It is the only thing *in* the whole world that is hostile *to* the whole world-system. One Book only has man attempted to destroy; and yet, in this attempt, though in it all his powers and resources have been employed, he has most conspicuously and ignominiously failed. Why?

A little less than a century and a half ago a book made its appearance which attracted wide attention, particularly in the upper circles of intellect and culture. It was vauntingly entitled the "Age of Reason," and its author, Thomas Paine, was probably without superior in intelligence among his contemporaries. So confident was the author of this book that his reasonings proved the untrustworthiness of Scripture, and destroyed its claim upon the consciences of men as the revelation of the living God, that he predicted that in fifty years the Bible would be practically out of print. But nearly thrice fifty years have passed since this boast was uttered. The boaster and his book have passed away; and their very names are well-nigh forgotten. But the Word of God has maintained its place, and not by human power. They who believe and cherish it are a feeble folk. Not many wise, not many mighty, not many high-born are among them. They have no might of their own to stand against the enemies of the Bible. The situation resembles a scene recorded in 1 Kings 20:27, where the Israelites went out against the Syrians, and we read that "The children of Israel pitched before them like two little flocks of kids; but the Syrians filled the country."

But notwithstanding such great odds, the victory is certain. The enemies of the Bible have indeed filled the country. Yet, they shall all pass away; but the Word of the Lord shall not pass away.

Again, in more recent times, a book of man was put forth, and was hailed as a work which would quickly destroy the credibility of Scripture and put an end to its authority and influence. This was Charles Darwin's "Descent of Man," a book whose influence has been greater, doubtless, than any other that has made its appearance during a century past. The main feature of this work was that it set forth an explanation of the origin of living beings, including man, radically different from that of Genesis, and propounded a theory of propagation of living species directly contrary to the great and immutable law declared nine times over in the first chapter of the Bible in the brief but significant expression, "after his kind."

The delight which Darwin's book caused among the enemies of the Bible, and the spirit in which its appearance was welcomed, are well illustrated by the title bestowed upon it by the eminent naturalist Haeckel, who called it the "Anti-Genesis," declaring that by a single stroke Darwin had annihilated the dogma of Creation. But it was not because of its supposed contribution to truth that Darwin's book was so widely and cordially received, and his utterly unproved hypothesis so readily accepted as an "assured result of science." Its vogue was largely due to the fact that it struck at the very foundation of Scripture. It is useless to pretend that Darwin's theory might be true, and the Bible nevertheless entitled to respect. The Lord Jesus said to a learned man of His day, "If I have told you *earthly things,* and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of *heavenly things?*" (John 3:12). If the Bible does not give us a truthful account of the events of the six days recorded in its first chapter, it is not to be trusted as to *any* of its statements.

But we have now the record of about half a century since the publication of Darwin's book; and, though the great movements of unbelief and apostasy are swiftly running their predicted course, there never was a time when the absolute and divine accuracy of Scripture from beginning to end, was more firmly grasped and tenaciously held by those who know it best, and never a time since "science" began to be looked to as an authority and instructor of men when there was less "scientific" basis for the prevalent questioning of the statements of the Bible.

There can be, of course, no real conflict between the Bible and any true discovery of science. Such conflicts as have been supposed to exist arose from hasty and incorrect conclusions, whose chief value in the eyes of many lay in the fact that they contradicted the Bible. As science has been compelled, however reluctantly, to correct her blunders, or to acknowledge that supposedly demonstrated truths were at best but unproved conjectures, the "conflicts" have died out; so that, at the present time, the assured teachings of "science" afford no weapons against the statements of the Bible. On the contrary, the investigations of men, in fields of geology, physics, and palæontology, have brought into view much information recorded ages ago in the Bible, information which, at the time the latter was written, was not in the knowledge of man. As has been already said, there is not a single assertion of the Bible that is in conflict with any demonstrated fact of science. All the investigations, of all the searchers, in all the various fields of search, have not availed to produce evidence sufficient in character and amount to convict Scripture of a single false statement.

But it is time to bring to a close our remarks under this heading, though they might be greatly extended.

We have called attention to the strange fact that, of all the millions of books that have existed, the Bible is the only one that has excited deep and persistent hatred, the only Book

which men have sought to get rid of, and that by every conceivable means. We have further called attention to the still stranger fact that, in this attempt to destroy the Bible, the powers of state, of religion, and of learning, have all been enlisted, and that, nevertheless, the number of copies of the Bible goes on steadily increasing. How can these facts be explained except by the statement that "the Word of God is LIVING," and that the source of its life is beyond the reach of man—in the very Being of the Living God?

VII. THE BIBLE IS A DISCERNER OF HEARTS

The power of discernment belongs only to an intelligent living being; and the power of discernment possessed by man does not go beneath the surface of things. Yet the passage in Hebrews, already quoted (4:12), asserts that the Word of God is a "discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart."

This is a very remarkable statement, yet it is true, and millions of men have felt and recognized the searching and discerning power of the Word of God. We go to it not so much to learn the thoughts of other men, as to learn our own thoughts. We go to other books to find what was in the hearts and minds of their authors; but we go to this Book to find what is in our own hearts and minds. To one who reads it with ever so little spiritual intelligence, there comes a perception of the fact that this Book understands and knows all about him. It lays bare the deepest secrets of his heart, and brings to the surface of his consciousness, out of the unfathomable depths and unexplorable recesses of his own being, "thoughts and intents" whose existence was unsuspected. It reveals man to himself in a way difficult to describe, and absolutely peculiar to itself. It is a faithful mirror which reflects us exactly as we are. It detects our motives, discerns our needs; and having truthfully discovered to us our true selves, it counsels, reproves, exhorts, guides, refreshes, strengthens, and illuminates.

It has been pointed out that the Greek word rendered "discerner" in Hebrews 4:12, means literally "critic" (kritikos), and that this is its only occurrence in Scripture. How very significant is it that the designation "higher critics" has been assumed by that little coterie of men who claim to be able, by their own powers of literary discernment, to assign the dates of production of books and parts of books of Scripture, to detect spurious passages, alleged interpolations, and the like, and to split up books into fragments, assigning bits to one imaginary author and other bits to another; whereas as a matter of fact, it is the Bible itself that is the "Critic" of men.

This is in keeping with the subversive principles of this present evil age, wherein man is seeking to put himself in the place of God. This is "man's day." Man is now the critic of everything, and particularly of God's Word. Of that he is a *"higher* critic."

There is, however, no external evidence to support the higher critical views as to the late origin of the Pentateuch, Daniel, the latter part of Isaiah, etc.; *per contra* every pertinent discovery in the ruins of ancient cities corroborates the statements of Scripture. These theories rest entirely upon the alleged intuitive perceptions of sinful men, compassed about by infirmity, who claim to be able to pass infallibly upon the style and contents of each book of the Bible, to decide when it was written, by whom it could not have been written, and even to divide it up into various portions, assigning each to a different "source."

But high scholarship is not incompatible with belief in the full inspiration and accuracy of Scripture. Dean Burgon, one of the famous scholars of Oxford, says:

"I must be content with repudiating, in the most unqualified way, the notion that a mistake of any kind whatever is consistent with the texture of a narrative inspired by the Holy Spirit of God.

"The Bible is none other but the Word of God, not some part of it more and some part of it less so, but all alike the utterance of Him that sitteth upon the throne, absolute, faultless, unerring, supreme—'The witness of God which He hath testified of His Son.'"

The time is at hand when the haughtiness of man shall be brought low, and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day. Then the Word of God shall judge the critics.

Meanwhile, the living Word shall continue to be the discerning companion of all who resort to it for the help which is not to be had elsewhere in this world of the dying. In going to the Bible we never think of ourselves as going *back* to a book of the distant past, to a thing of *antiquity;* but we go to it as to a book of the *present*—a living book. And so indeed it is, living in the power of an endless life, and able to build us up and to give us an inheritance among all them that are sanctified. (Acts 20:32.)

VIII. THE TRANSLATABILITY OF SCRIPTURE

The Word of God manifests itself as a living Word in the very unique property it has of adapting itself and its message to all peoples, and of speaking in all languages, tongues and dialects. The extreme mobility and adaptability of Scripture, as manifested in this way, is comparable only to the power which a living being has of making himself at home in different countries from that in which he was born.

We have here again a characteristic which distinguishes the Bible from all other books, as any one may, with a little attention, clearly perceive. It is a universal rule that a book does not thrive except in the language in which it was written. Men's books will not always bear translation; and the greater the literary value of a book the more it is likely to suffer loss in being translated from one language into another. Change of locality is, to the great majority of books, absolutely destructive.

But to this rule the Bible is a marvellous exception. It seems to run freely into the mould of every language, to adapt itself perfectly thereto, and to speak with equal directness, clearness and authority to all peoples and tribes and nations, in their mother tongue. It does not occur to us that, in reading our common English Bible, we are reading a translation of an Oriental book; and indeed, when an example of the purest and best English is desired, men go with one accord to the Bible.

Considered merely as a poem, there is nothing more exquisite in the English language than the Twenty-third Psalm; and it has been stated that in other languages besides English this Shepherd Psalm is a model of poetical excellence. It never occurs to one reading it that he is reading a translation from another and very different language.

Is not this indeed a very extraordinary fact, and the more so when we consider that the Bible, though a unit, is at the same time highly composite? It comprises specimens of every kind of literature, historical, poetical, biographical, didactic, prophetic, epistolary, etc.

Moreover, it is not the production of a single human being, clothed in a uniform literary style of dress. On the contrary, its several parts were penned by men in widely varying stations in life, from herdsmen and unlearned fishermen, to kings and statesmen; and its styles are as divergent as its writers.

Nor was it the product of one era or period, which would tend to impart some common characteristics, and to prevent wide divergencies. As much as fifteen hundred years elapsed between the writing of its first and its last pages. Yet all parts and styles alike accommodate themselves to the change of language far more readily and perfectly than any human being is able to do when acquiring another tongue.

The property we are now considering is the more remarkable when we consider also the nation from which this unique

volume has come. The Jews were anything but a literary people. They were not at all remarkable for culture, learning, art, or philosophy; and they were quite cut off by their peculiar customs, traditions, and religious institutions, from the progressive nations around them. There is no other Jewish literature that is worth talking about. Yet, from such a people has come a volume whose sixty-six books, now that we have them all together, evidently constitute one complete structure, unitary in design, yet which was fifteen centuries in attaining its completed state. This book, after the Jewish people were disintegrated and scattered,—even as that very book had distinctly foretold,—and had become the most despised and persecuted people on earth, has entered into the place of supremacy in every nation which has attained to any degree of civilization, and has held that place without a rival for eighteen centuries, during which period of time every *human* institution has been overturned, not once only, but again and again.

Why is it that the universal Book did not have its origin in the literature of Greece, or of ancient Rome, or in the Elizabethan epoch of English literature? Why is it that nations which have been famed for their culture and literary genius have produced nothing comparable to the Bible? What collection of sixty-six books from the writings of about thirty authors of any nation could be made that would present any of the characteristics we have been noticing? Yet, it is certain that, if the Bible had a natural, instead of a supernatural origin, it would be far surpassed by the literary product of the literary nations of the earth.

This property of adaptability to all languages and peoples will impress us still more if we compare it in this respect with other Oriental books. The mere fact that it *is* an Oriental book makes its career among the Occidental nations still more miraculous. All attempts to domesticate other Oriental books, particularly sacred books, have been complete failures. Other

Oriental books are sought by scholars only, or by others who have a special interest for inquiring into their contents.

Already the Bible, or portions of it, has been translated into upwards of four hundred languages and dialects; so that it is revealing the grace of God in the gift of His Son, to practically every nation, kindred, tongue and tribe, throughout the world, and is speaking to all peoples *in their own native tongues.*

Like a living person, the Bible has made its way into all lands, has adapted itself to all environments, entered into relations of the most intimate kind with all peoples, and has exerted upon them all its own unique influence. It makes no difference what the people are to whom it goes, how radically different all their customs and institutions from those of that very peculiar people Israel; the Bible makes itself perfectly at home, and takes its own place without delay. Can this, or anything remotely approaching it, be said of any other book? And if not, are we not compelled, if we would have an explanation of this extraordinary difference, to fall back upon the statement that the "Word of God is living"? No other explanation will account for any of the facts we have been considering. This explanation accounts for them all.

The fact we are here considering, that is to say, the career of the Bible among the peoples of the earth, is, indeed, a stupendous and continuing miracle. Why has this particular Book gone to the ends of the earth, and assumed everywhere, and maintained against all opposition, the place of supremacy? What has given to this collection of writings, coming from an insignificant, peculiar, narrow-minded and isolated people, its *universal* character? Why is it that all other books, or collections of books, including the productions of the mightiest intellects and embodying the most superb and lofty specimens of human thought, wisdom, learning and experience, have been narrowly circumscribed in their area of influence, both as to time and space? Why has this particular Book continued ever

widening its sphere of influence as the centuries pass, while every other book, after its first vogue, steadily contracts and dwindles? Why does this Book increase while all others decrease?

There is no *natural* explanation for these remarkable facts. In this day, when a natural explanation is sought for all things, the wise men can advance no theory to account for these facts. We sometimes hear, from the enemies of the truth, the admission that the Bible is inspired, but coupled with the statement that other books are equally inspired. For example, a prominent preacher in New York city recently said in an article published in a popular magazine, "God spake to Abraham, and to Samuel and to Isaiah. He has spoken to Henry Ward Beecher, to Tennyson, and to Ruskin." But neither this prominent preacher, nor any other man who is trying in like manner to put the Word of God on the same level as other books, is able to tell us why the writings of these other "inspired" men do not afford some indications of their divine origin similar to those characteristics of the Bible to which we are now calling attention.

The Apostle Paul in the last of his writings (2 Tim. 2: 8, 9) said, "Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead according to my gospel; wherein I suffer as an evil-doer even unto bonds; but the *word of God is not bound.*"

In these words we have the sufficient and the only explanation of the extraordinary and unique career of the Bible. The human custodian of the Word of God may be bound, and may be treated as a malefactor for merely being the bearer of the message; but the living Word of the living God is not, and cannot be, bound. Jehovah Himself has said, "So shall My Word be that goeth forth out of My mouth. It shall not return unto Me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it" (Isa. 55:11).

But there is more to be noted under this heading. The Bible is the universal Book also in that it not only speaks to all peoples in their own mother tongue, but it addresses itself to all classes of society. Missionaries from every part of the world have reported how the most depraved, ignorant and vicious people will listen at once to the words of Scripture as to no other book, and will recognize them as "good words." Like God Himself His Word is no respecter of persons. Indeed, its sternest denunciations are addressed to persons of rank and of social, ecclesiastical, or political prominence. Its best promises are for the meek and lowly. It has a message for all men, and to the highest as well as the lowest it speaks "with authority," never exhorting from the standpoint merely of superior human wisdom and intelligence, but always as delivering the message of God.

The Bible adapts itself thus to successive generations of men, exhibiting to each individual human being an intimate knowledge of his characteristics, trials and needs. It seems to be waiting for an opportunity to become acquainted with each child of Adam, to direct the steps of his life-journey through this great and terrible wilderness, to warn him of dangers and pitfalls, and to be the man of his counsel to every one who wills not to reject its offer of fellowship. Does not this warrant us in saying that "the Word of God is LIVING"?

IX. THE WORD EXHIBITS THE CHARACTERISTIC OF GROWTH

Growth is one of the characteristics of a living being. The Word of God lodges and grows in human hearts, for there is its real lodgment, rather than in the printed page. The Psalmist says, "Thy Word have I hid in my heart" (Ps. 119:11).

The book of Deuteronomy has much to say about the Word of God. In chapter thirty it declares (verse 14) that "The Word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart."

This is repeated in Romans 10:8, with the addition, "that is, the word of faith which we preach."

In 1 Thessalonians 2:13 Paul says to the Thessalonians, "When ye received the Word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the Word of God, which *effectually worketh also in you* that believe." The believing heart is its lodgment, and there it works to effect some definite results.

In Colossians 3:16 we have the admonition, "Let the word of Christ dwell *in* you richly in all wisdom." It is in the believing heart that the Word dwells richly.

The Lord Jesus, in explaining the parable of the sower, said, "The seed is the Word of God" (Luke 8:11); and again, "The sower soweth *the Word*" (Mark 4:14). (A seed, of course, is worthless except it have life in it.) And He further explained that the seed which fell on good ground "are they which, *in an honest and good heart*, having heard the Word keep it, and bring forth fruit with patience" (Luke 8:15). To the unbelieving Jews the Lord said, "And ye have not His Word *abiding in you;* for whom He hath sent, Him ye believe not" (John 5:38).

In Colossians 1:5, 6, Paul speaks of the "Word of the truth of the Gospel, which is come unto you, as it is in all the world, and bringeth forth fruit."

In these passages we have presented to us the thought of the Word as a living seed or germ, first finding lodgment in the heart of man, and then abiding and growing there.

The growth of the Word of God is specifically mentioned in several striking passages in the Acts of the Apostles. Acts 6:7: *"And the Word of God increased;* and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly."

Here we are told specifically that the Word of God increased. We learn from this that the mere multiplication of copies of the Scriptures is in itself of no importance. It is of no avail to have the Book in the house, and on the shelf

or table, if it be not taken into the heart. But when so received into the heart, the Word of God grows and increases. It is assimilated into the life of him who receives it, and henceforth is a part of himself.

It is important to note what stimulated this recorded increase of the Word of God. The Apostles, who were its custodians or depositories, had found themselves taken up with ministering to the material wants of the flock, and they brought this matter before the body of disciples saying, "It is not reason that we should leave the *Word of God* and serve tables," and they asked that suitable men be appointed for that service while they should give themselves continually "to prayer and the ministry of the Word."

The growth of the Word then, accompanied by a great multiplication of the number of disciples, was the result of faithful ministry of the Word—a ministry which was sustained by prayer.

This method of promoting the growth of the Word of God is highly important. Every believer, having the Word in his heart and in his mouth, may be and should be the means of its propagation; and the extent to which the Word has been spread abroad in this inconspicuous way will not be known until the time when all things shall be manifested. There are great multitudes who would never get the Word from the printed page, or from the spoken sermon or address. Hence the importance of these epistles of Christ written not with ink, but with the SPIRIT of the living God, not in tablets of stone, but in the fleshy tablets of the heart. (2 Cor. 3:3.) Such epistles are read by many who never read the printed page; and the eternal destiny of many souls may depend upon the distinctness and legibility of that writing. May our lives, as believers, be so transparent that the Word written in our hearts may be distinctly seen; and thus, as sons of God we shall shine "as lights in the world holding forth the Word of life" (Phil. 2:15, 16).

The second passage which speaks expressly of the growth of the Word of God is Acts 12:21-24. In this chapter are narrated the last episodes in the life of Herod Antipas. In the first part of the chapter we read how he killed James, the brother of John, with the sword, and finding this course to be popular with the Jews, he apprehended Peter also, and put him in custody, intending after the passover to make this leader of the Apostles the object of a public demonstration, which doubtless would have strengthened Herod still further in the regard of the people. But Peter was delivered from prison by an angel of the Lord who was sent for that purpose.

The closing verses of the chapter tell of a disagreement between Herod and the citizens of Tyre and Sidon, some undescribed incident having occurred which caused the former to be highly displeased with the latter. But they, having gained the favor of King Herod's chamberlain, one Blastus, made overtures of peace and sent a delegation to the king. The reception of this embassy was made an occasion of much pomp and circumstance. Herod put on his royal apparel, sat upon his throne, received the delegation, "and made an oration unto them." This oration was received with extravagant demonstrations. "The people gave a shout, saying, It is the voice of a god, and not of a man."

Herod accepted this tribute, and no doubt was highly pleased therewith. But it is a dangerous thing for mortal and sinful man, however high his station, to accept glory which belongs to God alone. For *immediately* the angel of the Lord smote him, because he gave not God the glory; and he was *eaten of worms* and gave up the ghost. *"But the word of God grew and multipled."*

There is a tremendous lesson here for the many who, in these closing days of the age, are participating in the various movements which, however diverse in appearance, have all the common object of putting man in the place of God, and the word of man in the place of the Word of God. Herod was

not stricken down for persecuting the Church, for imprisoning Peter, or for putting James to death, nor yet for his previous murder of John the Baptist. He was smitten for permitting his word to be acclaimed as the Word of God. Herod had often heard the Word of the Lord, for he had listened attentively to the preaching of the Baptist. He had heard of the ministry and miracles of the Lord Jesus, and had even seen Him on that dark betrayal night. He was, therefore, not smitten for something done in ignorance.

The angel of Jehovah had two ministries in that chapter. One was to deliver Peter, who, according to the word of his Lord, was to serve Him to old age (John 21:18). The other was to declare, by smiting the King, the difference between the Word of God and that of the most important man of the country.

Doubtless that was a great oration which Herod delivered on that day. It contained most probably striking utterances, pregnant with wisdom and garbed in the attractions of human eloquence. It was, moreover, the King on his throne who spoke, and we know how the throngs gather to listen on such occasions.

On the other hand, and in striking contrast, the Word of God was in the charge of "unlearned and ignorant men," a despised and persecuted company, whose Leader had but just suffered the ignominious death of a malefactor. What then has become of the words of King Herod? All have utterly perished, centuries ago, from the memory of men. He himself was eaten of worms; "But the Word of God grew and multipled," and has continued so to do from that time to the present.

Not very long ago, at the convening of the American Congress, a message from the President was addressed to that body. Much comment was made on that message because of its great length. Some industrious person counted the words, and found them to be upwards of thirty thousand. They

were serious words, too, and weighty, as human utterances go. They dealt with the most important affairs and interests of the nation that regards itself as the greatest on earth. But they were not "the words of eternal life." And for all that the occasion was so recent, and the subject matter so important, it is doubtful if any person can now recall a single sentence of that great message. Few, indeed, would care to do so, or would receive the slightest benefit therefrom, if they could.

The words of kings, and emperors, and presidents, are dying words. From the moment of their utterance they begin to perish; but "the Word of God is living." Being the utterance of the living God that Word can never pass away.

The last of the three passages which speaks of the growth of the Word of God is in Acts 19; and again the context adds greatly to the impressiveness of the lesson taught by the passage.

The scene of the first of the three incidents was in Jerusalem, of the second in Cæsarea, just west of Galilee, and of the third in Ephesus, a Gentile city. Thus there is special mention made of the growth of the Word of God in Judea, in Palestine outside of Judea, and in the Gentile regions beyond. This would seem to signify that the Word of God was not to be limited to territorial boundary, but was to spread and grow in every part of the earth.

The Apostle Paul had spent two years in Ephesus, preaching to such purpose that "all they which dwelt in Asia heard the Word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks." And God, moreover, "wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul" (Acts 19:10, 11).

One result of this ministry was that "many of them which used curious arts brought their books together, and burned them before all men; and they counted the price of them and found it fifty thousand pieces of silver. *So mightily grew the word of God and prevailed*" (verses 19, 20).

This is, indeed, a very notable event—a grand demonstration of the power and sufficiency of the Word of God. These books, intrinsically worth so great a sum as fifty thousand pieces of silver, became worse than worthless in the hands of their owners after the latter had received the Word of God. The books thus destroyed had been held in the highest estimation, because they were the manuals of necromancy, or occult arts. They instructed their readers in just such things as are coming into great favor in the present day. But when their owners "believed," they could no longer practice the "curious arts," or even retain the books that described them.

It is very easy to destroy the books of men. Great and mighty as are the powers of darkness which were back of the books burned at Ephesus, those evil powers are not comparable to that which has directed the career of the Word of God. Many have been the attempts to consume it in the flames, but in vain; for the Word of God is living.

This scene at Ephesus has been re-enacted in many a human life. When in quest of help, enlightenment, wisdom, guidance, and knowledge of the unseen, men turn to books; and though disappointed again and again, the inquiring mind, which has felt the need of a source of light external to itself, and has realized that there must be such a source somewhere, never shakes off the habit of seeking it in books. There appears to be a deep-seated consciousness that the desired help is to be found in some book. But men cannot impart to the books written by them what is not in themselves; and so they who gather many books gain little to compensate for their cost and labor. Conjectures and human opinions, philosophies and vain deceits, with all the obscurities and contradictions contained in them, do but leave the mind in perplexity and bewilderment concerning every matter of real importance. And, after all, if one cannot have certainties, but must put up with mere opinions, why should he not prefer his own to another man's, seeing that all are at the best but mere guesses,

whereof one is as likely to be true as another? The "wise men" can tell us nothing, for "lo, they have rejected the Word of the Lord; and what wisdom is in them?" (Jer. 8:9).

But when, to one who has undergone this weariness of a vain quest for something sure and satisfying in the books of men, the Word of God comes with the convincing power which it alone possesses, and with the restful assurance which it alone can impart, the books of men become worthless—mere rubbish, fit only to be food for flames. Conjectures are now exchanged for certainties, and profitless speculations for knowledge certified by the sure testimony of Him who knoweth and understandeth all things.

The writer lately heard a servant of Christ relate an incident in his own life which aptly illustrates what we have been saying. Speaking on the injunction of Ephesians 6:10, "Be strong in the Lord," he said, "I well remember a section in my book-case long ago which contained a highly prized set of Emerson's works. One essay in particular I read and re-read, and had marked favorite passages in it. The burden of it was, 'Young man, be strong.' This phrase occurred again and again, and it thrilled and excited me. But it pointed me to no source of strength, for the writer knew of none. He never once said, 'Be strong in the Lord;' and the time came when, realizing the cruel mockery of the words, and the emptiness of this entire system of philosophy, I put the set of well-printed and choicely bound volumes into the flames." He discovered in the Bible the Source of all strength, and the Book displaced the entire set of man's philosophies and empty deceits. "So mightily grew the Word of God and prevailed."

Happy is the man who has "received the Word of God" (Acts 8:14; 11:1, etc.), who has made room for it in his life, and in whose heart and mind it has grown and prevailed.

X. A LIFE-GIVING WORD

We come now to something higher and deeper. The great mystery of a living thing is the power it possesses of propa-

gating its kind. To trace the stream of life to its source is confessedly impossible to man, nor does any philosophic theory account for that stream. The attempt made in recent years to explain life as a mere property of atoms of non-living matter grouped in certain complex combinations, has been confessedly a failure. Professor Huxley, probably the ablest defender of this theory, and who at one time predicted that "protoplasm" (as he named the physical basis of life) might one day be produced in the laboratory, was constrained to admit, before his death, that there was no known link between the living and the non-living.

In the era of great scientific activity which marked the last half of the nineteenth century, many and persistent efforts were made to bring about spontaneous generation; that is to say, to demonstrate that life could be caused by human manipulation to spring up out of non-living matter, and apart from antecedent life. Great was the desire of unbelieving men of science to find a support for this theory, for if established it would flatly contradict the first chapter of the Bible, and thus discredit the statements of the latter upon a subject of the highest importance. In that chapter the first law of biology is enunciated in the words "after his kind;" and this law is applied both to the vegetable kingdom and to the animal—to grass, and herb, and fruit tree, to fowl and fishes, and creeping things, to wild beast and tame beast. Each was commanded to bring forth "after his kind;" and it is needless to say that each has strictly obeyed that Divine command.

The inspired account of Creation does not describe the method whereby God brought into existence the several species of living creatures, and gave to each the distinct characteristics which were to be its perpetual and unvarying endowment. This matter, therefore, belongs to the realm of speculation, into which it is unprofitable to enter. What concerns us is the fact, distinctly stated, and manifestly deemed by the Spirit of God to be of great importance for our instruction in the truth, that

God, in creating the numerous species of living creatures, vegetable and animal, put a permanent difference between them, rigidly confining each species to the reproduction of its own kind.

So important was this law in the mind of the Creator, and so careful was He to impress it upon the mind of man, that the formula is stated nine times in the first chapter of Genesis. There is an emphasis in this which has great significance in view of the theory of organic evolution, which, but a few years ago, was advanced as a "scientific" explanation of the origin of species of living beings, and was accepted as such by nearly all the wise and learned of this world.

After many years' investigation of the philosophy of evolution, an investigation carried on in full sympathy with the widest application of that captivating theory, I have yet to see proof of *a single fact* showing, or tending to show, the operation of the so-called "law" or "principle" of evolution in the world of Nature. No instance has ever been found of a living thing of one species coming from ancestors of another species; and there is not the slightest ground for the belief that such a thing ever happened. On the other hand, every one of the countless billions of reproductions of living creatures—the grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit—which occur every year, are in accordance with the divine command recorded in the first chapter of Genesis. Oak trees have never betrayed the slightest tendency to produce any fruit but acorns, nor acorns to produce any trees but oaks. The theory of organic evolution, promulgated by Darwin and Wallace, has nothing to commend it except that it offers an alternative to the acceptance of the account of the origin of species given in the Bible.

The attempts made by the empiricists of the last century to bring about, or to demonstrate the possibility of, spontaneous generation of living organisms by human manipulation apart from pre-existing organisms of the same species, were at first

thought to have been successful. Infusions of hay were prepared which, after being tightly sealed in suitable flasks, were heated to a temperature sufficiently high (as was supposed) to destroy all life within the flasks. These were then set aside for awhile, and kept under observation; and in the course of time they were found to contain minute livng organisms. These "results of science" were heralded far and wide, and great was the rejoicing occasioned thereby.

But other men of science, among whom the most prominent was Liebig, went over the ground again, repeating the experiments more carefully; and their results showed that, in the earlier experiments, either the flasks had not been tightly sealed, or else the heat to which they were exposed had not been sufficiently great to destroy all the living organisms therein. So conclusive were these later experiments that the theory of spontaneous generation (or "abiogenesis") has had no standing whatever from that time to the present.

The following quotations will accurately inform the reader as to the best scientific opinion on this subject.

Lord Kelvin who, until his recent death, held the leading place among scientific men, used this positive language:

"Inanimate matter cannot become living except under the influence of matter already living. This is a fact in science which seems to me as well ascertained as the law of gravitation."

Again he said: "I am ready to accept as an article of faith in science, valid for all time and in all space, that *life is produced by life and only by life.*"

Professor Huxley, the advocate of the theory of "animal automatism," who at one time contended earnestly that vitality was merely a property of "protoplasm," (that is to say, the property of a particular chemical compound of carbon, oxygen, hydrogen and nitrogen) left this record before his death: "The present state of knowledge furnishes us with no link between the living and the not-living."

Professor Tyndall says: "Every attempt made in our day to generate life independent of antecedent life has utterly broken down."

Such has indeed been, and such must ever be, the result of all human attempts to start the flow of a stream of life, or to divert one which God has started, so as to change the form of manifestation which the Author and Giver of life has given to each species of living creatures.

We wish the reader to understand that we rest nothing whatever upon the outcome of the foregoing scientific controversy, nor upon the above quoted (or any other) statements of human opinion however high their source. Faith has no foundation other than the Word of God.

Men of science may be right or wrong in their deductions from the fragmentary information possessed by them. Generally they are wrong, as is clearly enough shown by the fact that a large part of the work of each generation of men of science consists in overturning or modifying the theories of their predecessors. The foregoing is given as an illustration of the utter futility of setting up the deductions of the human reason against the assertions of the Word of God, and as a caution to the reader, if he be a child of God through faith in Jesus Christ, not to give the slightest credence to any statements made in the name of "science" or "scholarship" which call into question what is written in the inspired Scriptures.

We may ask then, Is the Word of God a living Word in this particular sense? Does it have the mysterious power of imparting life; and if so, is the life it imparts of the same sort as its own? Does it reproduce "after its kind"?

This brings up the great subject of spiritual conception and generation, concerning which the Scripture gives not a little information. Into this highly interesting but difficult subject we will not now enter. Even the beginning and maintenance of physical life in plants and animals (including man) are great and inscrutable mysteries. This is true in all stages of

the process, particularly in the initial stage of germination, which is the beginning of a new individual existence by the quickening of a seed derived from a previously existing individual of the same species. How much more mysterious, then, must be the process of spiritual generation! The Lord Jesus, in His conversation with the learned and intellectual Pharisee, Nicodemus, indicated that the subject was a very mysterious one, by the words, "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but *canst not tell* whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: *so* is every one that is born [or begotten] of the Spirit."

Therefore, even after we have learned all that is given us to know concerning the beginning of physical life in the naturally begotten, and of spiritual life in the supernaturally begotten, the subject remains as mysterious as ever, since the Author of life has reserved it among the "secret things" which "belong unto the Lord our God" (Deut. 29:29).

But the *fact* of natural generation cannot be questioned, though the *process* be involved in unfathomable mystery. The fact of spiritual generation is equally sure to all who believe the Word of God. The Bible plainly declares it, and those who believe on the Christ of God know also by experience the beginning of a new kind of life in their own souls.

For present purposes it is sufficient to point out that spiritual generation is analogous (as might be expected) to natural generation, being effected by means of a seed, which, having been deposited in a prepared place, is quickened by the Spirit of God, and becomes itself "spirit,"—that is to say a new nature which is spiritual in its character; for "that which is born [or begotten] of the Spirit is spirit" (John 3:6).

The fact of spiritual conception, and the nature of the seed whereby it is effected, are plainly declared in 1 Peter 1:23: "Being born [or having been begotten] again, not of corruptible *seed,* but of incorruptible, by THE WORD OF GOD WHICH LIVETH and abideth for ever."

There is an immense amount of truth of the highest importance contained in this passage; but the statement which especially concerns us is that the seed of the new birth is from the living Word ("the Word which LIVETH"). This statement plainly teaches that the Word of God possesses the highest endowment of a living being, namely, that of imparting life. And with this agrees the teaching of the Lord Jesus in the parable of the sower, in the explanation of which He said, "The *seed* is the Word of God" (Luke 8:11).

In consequence of the transgression and fall of the first man, who was the original depository of the life of humanity (Gen. 2:7), the life in him, being "corruptible," became vitiated. Hence, by inexorable law, the seed of his generations also became corrupted. It follows that all men in their natural generation are begotten of corruptible (and corrupted) seed; and have received (and hence must impart to their succeeding generations) a corrupted life. What, therefore, was needed, in order to bring into existence a human family answering to God's purpose in the creation of man (Gen. 1:26), was a new and *incorruptible seed*. This has been supplied in the Word of God. All who believe that Word are begotten again (or from above); not this time of corruptible seed, "but of incorruptible, by the Word of God *which liveth*." It is a living Word.

It is to be noted that this Scripture testifies that the seed of the living Word is not merely uncorrupted, but is "incorruptible." It partakes, therefore, of the nature of the "uncorruptible God" (Rom. 1:23).

This is the guaranty to us that the Word of God is not subject to the corrupting influences of the corrupted and decaying world into which it is come. It is the *only thing* which has not succumbed to the forces of decay and death which reign universally in the earth. Indeed, it has not been affected in the slightest degree by those forces. This has been pointed out at length in the foregoing pages; but the grand truth comes to us with peculiar force in connection with the passage in 1

Peter. We need not be at all concerned as to whether the truth of God, embodied by Him in His word, has been corrupted, for it is incorruptible. And by that Word they who believe are begotten again through the operation of the Holy Spirit. To them "the Spirit is life" (Rom. 8:10).

The same truth is declared in James 1:18, in the words, "Of His own will begat He us with the Word of Truth."

Such is the spiritual conception of the "sons of God." These are born, or begotten. In no other way is a "son" brought into existence save by being begotten of a father. The sons of God must be begotten of God. The Apostle John tells us that they are begotten, "not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man" (John 1:13). The Apostle James tells us that "of His own will" they are begotten. Therefore, though the process be inscrutably mysterious, there can be no doubt as to the fact. When the Word of God is truly "heard" and thereby received into a prepared heart, that word becomes truly a seed, spiritual and incorruptible in nature, which, when quickened by the Spirit of God, becomes the life-germ of a new creature—a son of God.

The same truth is very clearly taught in our Lord's explanation of His parable of the sower, to which reference has already been made. Inasmuch as we have His own interpretation of this parable, we need be in no uncertainty as to its meaning. He says, "Those by the wayside are they that hear; then cometh the Devil and taketh away *the Word out of their hearts,* lest they should *believe* and be saved" (Luke 8:12). And again: "But that on the good ground are they which, in *an honest and good heart,* having heard the Word keep it and bring forth fruit with patience."

The method of spiritual conception set forth in these Scriptures, which is effected in a manner quite analogous to natural conception, furnishes the explanation of the connection between "believing" and "life" referred to in many passages of Scripture. One of the most familiar of these is John 5:24

where the Lord Jesus states in the simplest language that the man who hears His Word and believes on Him who sent Him has everlasting life, and is passed out of death into life. Such a man receives the seed in his heart, and the seed is there quickened into life.

Indeed, the great purpose of the Written Word is to impart life—even eternal (that is to say divine) life—to those who are dead through trespasses and sins. The Gospel of John, which is devoted largely to the great subject of eternal life, and from which a large part of our information concerning it is derived, was "written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God and that *believing* ye might have *life* through his name" (John 20:31).

The same truth is declared in the familiar passage in Romans 10:9, which sets forth very definitely the special truth which constitutes the substance and marrow of God's revelation in His Word, and which He calls upon men to believe and obey through the preaching of the Gospel, namely that Jesus Christ, who died for sinners, has been *raised from the dead,* and that He is Lord of all, to the glory of God the Father.

The main point to be apprehended in this connection is that a certain state of preparedness of heart is necessary in order that the "good seed" of the Word may germinate and grow there. Such a prepared heart is described in Scripture as a *believing* heart. That prepared state is manifested when a man *believes God,* as Abraham did (Rom. 4:17); or, in other words, when a man is ready to receive the Word of God *as* the Word of God, as the Thessalonians did (1 Thess. 2:13).

When a man has been brought, by the operation of the Spirit of God, who is the "Spirit of LIFE in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:2, 10), into this state of preparation, then the Word of God, being received into the heart, acts as a seed falling into good soil. Though it be (as we might say) but the tiniest portion of God's truth as revealed in His Word which is thus received by faith, yet it suffices through His power as the

means whereby He may quicken a dead soul. For surely the life of the Word is in every part thereof.

Such is the power of the *living* truth to impart life; and herein lies the difference between the truth which God has revealed in His Word, and truth which may be found elsewhere. For there is much truth which is not *living* truth. The multiplication table is truth; but it is not living truth. It has no quickening power. The theorems of geometry are truth; but they are not living truth. Never yet has any man been heard to testify that he had been the wretched and hopeless slave of sin, and had continued in spiritual darkness, fast bound in misery and vice until his eyes were opened by the great truth that two and two make four, or that three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles; and that thereby his life had been transformed, his soul delivered from bondage, and his heart filled with joy and peace in believing. On the other hand, in the case of a true conversion, it may have been but the shortest and simplest statement of "the Word of the truth of the Gospel" (Col. 1:5) that was heard and believed, such as that "Christ died for the ungodly" (Rom. 5:6), yet it suffices, through the mighty power of Him who raised up Christ from among the dead, to quicken together with Christ a soul that previously was dead in trespasses and sins (Eph. 1:20; 2:5). Thus the Word of truth becomes, in some inscrutable way, the vehicle for imparting that life of which the risen Christ, the Incarnate Word, is the only Source. Eternal life for the individual soul begins through believing "the testimony of God" (1 Cor. 1:2), and the testimony of God which He has in grace given to perishing sinners that they may believe and be saved, is *"concerning His Son"* (Rom. 1:3; 1 John 5:10). "And this is the record [or testimony], that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son" (1 John 5:11). Therefore it is written of those who experienced the new birth, "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:26).

The teaching and preaching of the day are largely permeated by a notion to the effect that "science" is in some undefined way supplying to a greater or less extent new foundations for religious faith. We cannot, therefore, insist too strongly upon the *vital* difference (—for it *is* vital—being a difference upon which life depends) between truth revealed by God through His Word, and truth discovered by the investigations of man, and generally spoken of as "scientific" truth. Truth thus obtained has *no relation whatsoever* to faith and eternal life; and the effort to substitute it for, or to oppose it to, the truth revealed in God's Word as the basis of faith, must be ascribed to the activity of the "spirit of error."

Many unspiritual teachers in these last days, and many superficial readers of Scripture, deem it incredible that salvation, which is the beginning of the life of the risen Christ in the soul of a perishing man, should be wrought through an operation so apparently simple as that of receiving God's Word, through faith, into the heart.

The clear declarations of God's Word on this subject are indeed frequently ridiculed in pulpit utterances. But to such minds the germination of a seed by merely casting it into the ground would be equally incredible. These spiritually-blinded ones, wise in their own conceits, miss altogether the teaching of the Bible concerning the wonderful process of spiritual conception and generation, which, in view of the equally mysterious process of natural conception, should not be deemed "a thing incredible." "For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made" (Rom. 1:20).

The passage in 1 Peter 1 sets forth, moreover, the fact that spiritual generation through the Word of God conforms to the great biological law stated with such emphatic iteration in the first chapter of Genesis, namely, that the life imparted is the same in kind as that of its source, all the characteristics of the latter being reproduced in it. Emphasis is laid on the fact

that the seed is incorruptible, and that the Word, which is its source, is eternal. Moreover, as in John's Gospel, the new, incorruptible, and eternal life, which proceeds from spiritual conception by the Word of God, is put into direct contrast with the natural life or "flesh." "For," continues the Apostle Peter, "all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of *man* as the flower of grass." The prominent characteristic of grass is that it withereth, and of the flower of grass, or of plant life, is that it falleth away. "The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: but"—in direct contrast with this—"the Word of the Lord endureth for ever." So it does, and so do all they who are begotten of the incorruptible seed of the Word.

The passage closes with the unmistakably plain statement, "And this is the Word which, by the Gospel, is preached unto you."

The result of spiritual generation is, of course, a spiritual infant—a babe. Consequently the next words of the inspired Apostle are in full keeping with, and in confirmation of, the truth we have been considering. "Wherefore, laying aside all malice, and all guile, and hypocrisies, and envies, and all evil speakings" (which are characteristics of the "old man") "*as new-born babes,* desire the sincere milk of the Word, that ye may grow thereby" (1 Peter 2:1, 2). We all know that it is of the first importance that a babe should have appropriate nourishment in order that it may grow; but this belongs to the subject of spiritual nutrition, which will be considered later on.

Other Scriptures testify with equal clearness to the great and glorious truth that those who are begotten of the Spirit, through the incorruptible seed of the Word, receive a nature of the same sort as that of the Divine Source of their life. In the eighth chapter of Romans there is a section devoted to the "sons of God," in whom the Spirit dwells (verses 9-16); and of these it is declared that God predestinated them "to be conformed *to the image of His Son,* that He might be the first-born among many brethren" (verse 30).

Here the truth of likeness with the Son of God is broadly stated. Other passages declare specific features included in this general likeness. Thus 1 John 3:9 states that "whosoever is born of God doth not commit [or practice] sin; for His [God's] seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin because he is born [begotten] of God. In this the children of God are manifest." The new nature which characterizes the new creature is one that cannot sin; and hence, when this new nature begins to manifest itself in the quickened soul, there is a struggle between its desires and those of the old nature ("the flesh"); for the flesh has desires against the Spirit, and the Spirit has desires against the flesh, and these are directly opposed, the one to the other (Gal. 5:17). Every one who has been begotten from above knows from experience what this struggle means.

Again, in 1 John 3:2, 3, it is stated that now, even at the present time, are we (believers) the sons of God, though we appear so little like it. What we shall be does not yet appear; but we know, upon the clear testimony of Scripture, that "when He shall appear we shall be *like Him;* for we shall see Him as He is."

These statements are so clear that it is not necessary to cite to those who believe the Word of God other passages which declare that spiritual procreation is according to the law repeated nine times in Genesis 1, "after his kind."

In closing this important section of our subject (which might be greatly amplified if our purpose were to treat exhaustively the great truth of spiritual generation) it will be profitable to notice briefly the close relation between the Written Word and the Incarnate Word in the matter of the impartation of spiritual life.

This truth brings before us the Son of God in His wonderful and unique character of the Source of Life to a world and to human beings, which had fallen under the power and dominion of death.

"Through one man [Adam] sin entered the world, and death through sin, and so death passed upon [*lit.* passed through to] all men" (Rom. 5:12). Thus death entered and established its universal sovereignty over all men. Such expressions as "death reigned," "sin reigned unto death" (Rom. 5:14, 17, 21), state a fact whereof the evidences meet our eye whichever way we look.

Therefore, after Adam's transgression and the ruin wrought by it, the most urgent need of the world was LIFE. To this end the Son of God became a partaker of flesh and blood, "that through death He might destroy him who had the power of death, that is the devil" (Heb. 2:14). "I am come," He said, "that they might have *life*" (John 10:10).

In the Gospel by John, the first thing asserted of Him, after setting forth His eternal Deity, and His mighty work as Creator, is the significant statement, "In Him was LIFE" (John 1:4). This is He who "cometh down from heaven and giveth life unto the world" (John 6:33).

We need not cite the many passages of Scripture which witness to Christ as the new Source of life to a world that had fallen under the power of death; but would call attention only to a few of those which connect Him directly with the wonderful process of spiritual generation.

The very first of all prophecies, that concerning the woman's "seed" (Gen. 3:15) is thus fulfilled in Him; and the designation "seed," thus at the very beginning applied to Him as coming in flesh and blood, carries with it the great promise of a new humanity which was to spring up from and out of Himself.

Again, as the "seed" of Abraham, He is the inheritor (for Himself and for His generations) of all the promises made "to Abraham and his seed." That we might not miss the meaning of this truth, so precious to those who, through faith, "are the children of Abraham" (Gal. 3:6), it is expressly stated as follows: "Now to Abraham *and his seed* were the promises

made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of ONE, And to thy SEED, which is Christ" (Gal. 3:16).

Finally, as David's seed He is the rightful Heir to the kingdom, which he will establish on the earth in the coming age. In promise of this there are many passages such as these: "I will raise up thy seed after thee, which shall be of thy sons; and I will establish his kingdom" (1 Chron. 17:11). "Upon David, and upon his seed and upon his house, and upon his throne, shall there be peace forever from the Lord" (1 Kings 2:33). "I have made a covenant with My chosen, I have sworn unto David My servant, thy seed will I establish forever, and build up thy throne to all generations" (Psa. 89:3, 4). "His seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before Me" (Psa. 89:36).

Thus Christ is set forth as the Seed of the woman, as the Seed of Abraham, and as the Seed of David.

But the great purpose of a seed, and its marvelous inherent power, is to reproduce its kind; and the designation "seed" as applied to the Son of Man has this significance also. He Himself takes up this great lesson when he refers to Himself as the kernel of wheat, saying: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn [kernel] of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit" (John 12:24).

Thus the One who alone had a title to live as a man of flesh and blood, laid *that* life down, submitting voluntarily to the power of death, in order that, instead of dwelling forever "alone" (as man) He might bring forth "much fruit." These are His generations, the "many sons" which He brings into glory (Heb. 2:10), the "children" of whom He speaks saying, "Behold I, and the children which God hath given me" (Heb. 2:13).

If we keep in mind the fact that the grains of wheat in the ear are all reproductions of the original seed, we shall see how forcibly and beautifully the parable of the "corn of wheat"

teaches the lesson of spiritual generation. The life in those who have been quickened together with Christ (Eph. 2:5) is truly *His* life reproduced in them by the Holy Spirit, who is the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, and whose law sets us free from the law of sin and death (Rom. 8:2). We may thus say, "Christ who is our life" (Col. 3:4); and as this new life unfolds itself in the being of the believer, and manifests the characteristics of the One who is its source, the former is able also to say, "For me to live is Christ" (Phil. 1:21).

Whether, therefore, we are regarding the Written Word or the Incarnate Word, it is true (as has been well said) that "the Word" is the whole matter or substance of what God has revealed; but it is also true that any portion of that matter or substance which enters into a human heart, and which, as a seed, germinates and performs there the stupendous miracle of reproduction, is also the Word, imparting life "after his kind" —life incorruptible and everlasting as the Word itself.

Thus, in the highest sense of which we can take knowledge, the Word of God is a "Word of Life"—living and reproducing its kind; and thus is being fulfilled the promise to Him who died that we might live, of Whom it was said of old, "He shall see *His seed*, He shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in His hand. He shall see of the travail of His soul and shall be satisfied" (Isa. 53:10, 11).

The believer, too, may say with David, "As for me, I will behold Thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with Thy likeness" (Psa. 17:15). That will be glory for us; but, what is more important, it will be glory also for Him.

XI. THE LIFE-SUSTAINING WORD

The life possessed by human beings is not only a derived life, that is, a life obtained from an external source, but it is a dependent life, requiring continual sustenance. It must be sustained by constant and suitable nutrition, received into the body at short intervals. Man's strength whereof he boasts,

and indeed his very existence in the body, are dependent on food, and this food itself must be organic matter, that is to say, matter which has once been living. The fact of this dependence upon food, and upon food which man is utterly unable to make for himself out of inorganic matter, though all the materials are within his reach, should teach him a lesson in humility; but it seems not to have that effect.

We say that man is utterly unable to produce food-stuff though all the materials whereof it is composed are abundantly at hand. This is a pertinent and obvious fact, though one whereof little account is taken. God has imparted to the lowly plant the ministry of supplying food to all the animal creation, and has taught to it, and to it alone, the marvelous secret of converting the minerals of the earth and air—inert, lifeless elements, utterly incapable of furnishing nourishment to animals or man—into living tissue, endowed with the property of nourishing living creatures higher in the scale of life. "He causeth the grass to grow for the cattle, and herb for the service of man; that *he may bring forth food out of the earth*" (Psa. 104:14).

The humble vegetable organism knows how to extract the nitrogen from the earth, and the carbon from the carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, and to combine these, in exactly the proper proportions, with the oxygen and hydrogen in water, and with traces of lime and other elements, forming with the aid of heat and light from the sun, living tissue, suitable and necessary for food. This wonderful operation of chemical synthesis is carried on by the modest vegetable so unostentatiously as to attract little notice; and though it has been under the observation of inquisitive and imitative man for thousands of years he has not the faintest notion of how it is done. All the learning and skill of all the chemists in the world, with the resources of all the laboratories in the world, could not produce an ounce of food, though the elements out of which it is made exist everywhere, and in the greatest abundance.

But God, having imparted physical life to His creatures, has also made ample provision for the maintenance of that life, by supplying through the inscrutable synthesis carried on unceasingly by the vegetable kingdom, abundant food, capable, when taken into the body and properly assimilated, of supplying the waste that is constantly in progress in every part of the body, and of maintaining the strength thereof.

Furthermore, if the conversion of minerals into food-stuff by the members of the vegetable kingdom is a process displaying the marvelous wisdom of God, the process of digestion and nutrition is not less so. Nothing could be more improbable than that food, taken into the body by way of the mouth, should, without any attention or supervision from the tenant of that body, be digested, the valuable parts separated from the worthless, the latter discharged from the body, the former converted into tissue, muscle, bone, sinew, nerve-cell, blood-corpuscle, hair, nails, etc., and distributed automatically throughout the body, each to the place requiring it, and all in due proportion.

In this we have again a process far transcending the comprehension of the most learned men, who must eat and be nourished like other men, and who are equally ignorant of the process whereby their lives are sustained, and whereby they gain the strength which they use to deny God and glorify man.

Men boast in these days of their "independence," and make much of "self-reliance." But this is the height of presumptuous folly; for man is a most helplessly dependent creature, not even able, like the plant, to prepare his own food from the mineral elements, but dependent daily upon living creatures much lower than himself in the scale of being. And so far from having a basis for self-reliance, he does not know how to conduct the simplest of the vital processes of his own body. If his Creator, of whom principally man loves to fancy himself independent, should turn over to him the operation of the least

of those essential processes for the briefest time, the poor creature would miserably perish.

As with the physical life, so is it with the spiritual life of those who have been begotten again of the incorruptible seed of the Word. These spiritual beings require appropriate food; and God has abundantly provided for this need. In studying the important subject of spiritual nutrition we shall learn again the relation between Christ, the Incarnate Word, and the Written Word. Both are spoken of repeatedly as food for the children of God.

The third, fourth and fifth chapters of the Gospel by John treat of the imparting of eternal life as the free gift of God through Jesus Christ, the Son of God, to all who believe on Him; and the sixth chapter treats of spiritual nutrition. Therein, after feeding the multitude miraculously, thus showing Himself as the one by whose power food is multiplied in the earth, He reveals Himself as "the Bread of Life." Twice He says, "I am that bread of life" (verses 35 and 48) and in verse 33, "For the bread of God is He which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world." He Who gives the life is the One who also sustains it. Again He says, "I am the living bread which came down from heaven" (verse 51). And of His words He says, "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; *the words* that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life" (verse 63).

These sayings to the natural mind are, of course, meaningless; but they are addressed to faith. "How can this man give us His flesh to eat?" is the question which the unbelieving heart asks. How Christ can impart Himself to sustain the "inner man" is a question to which no answer can now be had. The process is incomprehensible to man. But we have seen that the process of physical nutrition is equally beyond human comprehension and contrary to all *a priori* probabilities.

Looking more particularly at what is said in this connection concerning the written or spoken Word of God we find that

the Word of God is "living" in the sense that, like other living substance, it has the property of furnishing nutrition, and thereby sustaining life. It is a life-sustaining Word. But here a notable difference attracts our attention. Physical food comes up out of the earth (Psa. 104:14), while spiritual food comes down out of heaven. (John 6:50.)

Reference has already been made to the fact that, after setting forth the great truth of spiritual conception and generation through the incorruptible seed of the Word of God, the Apostle Peter enjoins attention to spiritual nutrition. "Wherefore," he says, "as new-born babes desire the sincere milk of the word that ye may grow thereby" (1 Peter 2:1, 2). Evidently his Lord's threefold injunction, "Feed My sheep," "Feed My lambs," had impressed upon him the importance of spiritual nutrition. But proper feeding requires appetite for wholesome food, and so he seeks to excite a desire in young Christians for that whereby they may grow. And he immediately connects the Word with Christ saying, "If so be ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious."

The importance of nourishing and sustaining the new life received upon coming to Christ, and the unhappy consequences which always result from neglect of the appropriate diet, have been so often and so forcibly stated by the servants of Christ that it seems hardly necessary to dwell upon this matter. What our subject specially calls for is to note the correspondence between God's way of sustaining man's physical life by food derived from a living source, and His way of sustaining the believer's spiritual life by food from a living source, that is to say from the living Word.

The passages which present the Word of God as the food for His children are very familiar; and in bringing them to mind again we would impress it upon our readers that these statements are not to be taken as if they were poetical or figurative, but as very literal, practical and immensely important. In making man it was not God's plan that he should

live by bread, or physical food alone, but "by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord" (Deut. 8:3). The manna was given to His people in the wilderness to teach them this lesson, and that they might learn their dependence upon God. Hence this passage was used by the Second Man in His combat with the devil in the wilderness, it being the purpose of the latter to inculcate in man the idea of independence of God. Thus did the Man Jesus Christ, with the Sword of the Spirit, strike sure and true at the central purpose of His great adversary.

It is by *every* word of God that man is to be fed. No part of the Bible can be neglected without loss and detriment; and it will be observed that there is, in the Bible, a variety of spiritual nutriment analogous to the variety of physical food which God has provided for the needs of the physical man. If there be milk for babes, there is also strong food for those who are mature. And there is the penalty of arrested growth paid by those who remain content with the relatively weak diet suitable for infants, who know, perhaps, only that their sins are forgiven; as the Apostle John says: "I write unto you, little children, because your sins are forgiven you" (1 John 2:12). But those who have to be fed on a milk diet, that is to say, the simplest elementary truths of the Gospel, are unskillful in the word of righteousness. Infants cannot do anything for themselves, much less can they prepare food, or render any service to others. Hence the Apostle Paul, writing to the Hebrews, upbraids some of them because, at a time when they ought to have been teachers, they had need to be taught again the first principles, and were become "such as have need of milk and not of strong food. For every one that useth milk is unskillful in the word of righteousness: for he is a babe. But strong food belongeth to them that are of full age" (Heb. 5:12-14).

Jeremiah says, "Thy words were found and I did eat them" (Jer. 15:16). Thereby he found spiritual strength to sustain

him in his most difficult and trying ministry, from which, because of his timid and sensitive disposition, he shrank back in agony of soul. To be a good and effective minister of Christ it is necessary that one be well nourished through partaking largely of the abundant spiritual food which the living Word supplies. Thus Paul admonished his child in the faith, Timothy, to whom he wrote, "If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things, thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ, *nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine*" (1 Tim. 4:6).

One practical point with reference to the process of nutrition should be noted. While the living creature cannot comprehend the process, and has no part whatever in supervising it, or carrying it on, and while he is therefore not responsible for the results, the process cannot be carried on unless he takes the food into his being and properly masticates it. Therefore, up to the point of swallowing the food, the living being is responsible, and his volition is exercised. After that the process passes beyond his knowledge and control. Food may be of the best quality, and may be in greatest abundance, but it imparts no nourishment while it remains in the pantry, or on the table.

In like manner the responsibility is with the child of God to partake of the spiritual food so plentifully provided, and to meditate therein day and night (Psa. 1:2). Meditation upon what is read is to spiritual nutrition what mastication is to physical nutrition; and it takes time. The result, however, is ample compensation for time so occupied, for we read of him who observes this simple rule of spiritual dietation that "He shall be like a tree planted by rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season, his leaf also shall not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper" (Psa. 1:3). It means a fruitful life, a vigorous and healthful life, and a prosperous life.

These results are just as sure to follow obedience to the laws of spiritual diet as physical nutrition is to follow attention to the proper reception of material food; and the contrary results are just as sure to follow neglect of those laws in the one case as in the other. The natural mind would be likely to demand an explanation; but faith does not require to know the process, it being sufficient to hear the command. If one refused to partake of his natural food until instructed as to the process of digestion he would starve. In each case the process is inscrutable, but the fact is certain.

XII. THE LIFE-TRANSFORMING WORD

FEEDING upon the Word of God, the bread of life, must necessarily be beneficial to the whole man, including his intellectual and physical being as well as his spiritual.

Much deference is paid in these days to the "powers of the mind." Intellectual prowess is what wins the victories in the fierce commercial struggle of the times. Business men are, of course, keen to take advantage of this condition, as may be seen by the many and costly advertisements of "brain foods;" and many millions of dollars are annually acquired by the shrewd exploiters of these preparations. This, of course, could not be unless there were multitudes who give heed to the assurance that, by the use of the advertised article, it is possible to produce "a new set of brains."

The Bible does not speak of a new set of brains, but it does say to believers, "Be renewed in the spirit of your mind" (Eph. 4:23), and, "Be not conformed to this world [or age], but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind" (Rom. 12:2). The new man requires a new mind, and provision is made to that end. The old mind, with all its habits of self-occupation (a sure breeder of unhappiness and discontent), its morbid tendencies, its craving for excitement and sensation, its imaginations, appetites, tastes, inclinations and desires, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of

God, is to be displaced, and a new mind substituted; for godliness has the promise of the vigor of the life that now is, as well as of that which is to come.

How, then, is this injunction to be carried out? It is of importance to millions of anxious souls to have a clear answer to this question. And it may be had. The every-day incidents and the atmosphere amid which the average man and woman spend their time are such as to produce mental disturbances and disorders to an extent which, if understood, and if anything could impress this thoughtless and excited age, would create wide-spread alarm. It was stated recently that there were twenty-eight thousand inmates of the insane asylums of New York State (a single state of the Union) prior to October, 1907, and that in six months following the industrial convulsion of that month the number of inmates was increased by three thousand. The startling increase in the number of suicides adds its forcible testimony; and the frequency with which one encounters cases of mental depression, insomnia, melancholia, and other nervous disorders, tells of wide-spread and insidious foes which attack the seat of reason, and which call for methods and means of defense and repair which are beyond the resources of medicine.

The writer knows by experience the indescribable horrors of depressed and morbid mental states, and knows, too, what a transformation is effected by the "renewing of the mind" according to the Biblical injunction. Full provision is made for this marvelous transformation, and the conditions wherein it is effected are plainly set forth and are accessible to every believer.

In this case the study of the word used in the command ("be transformed") will make us acquainted with the conditions essential to the transformation. The word in question seems to have been set apart by the Holy Spirit for the purpose of teaching the important and wonderful secret of the transformation of the believer, during his existence in the body, into

the likeness of Christ; so that all believers might be able to say with Paul, "We have the mind of Christ."

It will, therefore, surely repay the reader to note carefully the usages of this particular word. Its first occurrence is in the Gospel narratives of the Transfiguration of Jesus Christ, and is in fact the very word there translated "transfigured" (Matt. 17:2; Mark 9:2). The word is literally "metamorphosed." "His face did shine as the sun, and His raiment was white as the light." This may well serve to teach the nature of the change contemplated. It is one that brings the radiance of heaven into the mind and tinges even the commonplace things with a glow of heavenly light.

The next occurrence of the word is, as we have already seen, in Romans 12:2, where believers are enjoined to be not cut out on the pattern of this age, but to be metamorphosed or transfigured by the renewing of their minds.

The third and last occurrence of the word tells us plainly *how* this great transformation is brought about. For the Bible is a very practical book. It comes, moreover, from One Who understands perfectly the limitations of man, Who knows and declares that the latter is, in his natural state, "without strength," that is to say, utterly impotent (Rom. 5:6). We may be sure, therefore, that when God calls upon the quickened soul to do a thing, He puts the means required for it within His reach. And so, in these plain words we read the conditions requisite for effecting the desired transformation: "We all, with unveiled face, beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, *are changed* into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord" (2 Cor. 3:18).

The word here translated "are changed" is the same word (metamorphosed or transfigured) used in the other passages cited; and these are the only occurrences of that word in the Bible.

The teaching is very clear. When the Jews read the Word of God a veil is over their hearts, their minds being blinded

(verse 14). Or, as stated in Romans 11:25, "blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in." Hence, they do not behold there Him of whom the Scriptures testify. But, for us who believe, the veil is done away in Christ, and consequently, all we beholding are transfigured into the same image by the Divine and irresistible operation of the Holy Spirit.

If, when we look into the Word of God, *we do not see Christ there,* we look to no purpose, for He is everywhere in the Book.

Let it be carefully noted that this transformation is not the work of the man who beholds Christ in the Word; for the process is carried on while the former is not occupied with himself at all, or with his transformation, but is absorbed in the contemplation of the glory of the Lord. The transformation is effected by the power of the Spirit of God; and we may learn from this passage the important lesson that occupation with, and concern about, the work of the Spirit in us can only hinder that work. Let it suffice us that He Who has begun a good work *in us* will perform it until the day of Christ. (Phil. 1:6.) Our part, and it should be also our delight, is to be continually beholding or contemplating the glory of the Lord; and while so doing we *"are* changed" into the same image, and all the faster if we are unconscious of ourselves.

Let it be also noted that the transformation is a gradual operation, calling for steadfastness in contemplating the Object placed before us by the Holy Spirit. Little by little, as our gaze is fixed upon Him, the old traits and dispositions which are unlike Him are replaced by His own characteristics. Thus the work proceeds "from glory to glory." The conformation to His image, which is God's purpose for all the sons of God (Rom. 8:29), is not accomplished, as some would have it, by an instantaneous transfiguration, a convulsive upheaval and displacement of the old nature, brought about by working one's

emotions into an ecstatic state; but is accomplished gradually while the believer is continually occupied with Christ ("beholding"). There is no hysterical short-cut to the desired result. For Christ must be known from the Written Word under the tuition of the Holy Spirit; and the process should continue during the whole term of the believer's existence in the body.

Thus the living Word becomes the regulator and transformer of the minds of those who diligently seek it. Under its potent influence confusion of thought, perplexities, depressed mental states, and other hurtful conditions are dissipated, and the serene tranquillity and repose of the mind of Christ are reproduced in those who are redeemed by His precious blood.

We are passing through the domain of death, the country of the last enemy that is to be destroyed, and who has put all things in this scene under his feet (1 Cor. 15:26, 27). On every hand our eyes meet the unmistakable evidences of the supreme sovereignty of death. But in this domain of death there is a Living Word—a Living Word in a dying world. The forces of corruption and decay cannot fasten upon it, and it laughs at the attacks of its enemies.

But that Word is here, not merely to manifest life, but rather to impart life to those who are perishing, and to bring them into vital contact with the new Life-Source of humanity, the Son of God, the Second Man, the Lord from Heaven, Who liveth and was dead, and behold He is alive forevermore, and has the keys of death and of Hades (1 Cor. 15:47; Rev. 1:18). He, as Man, has crossed the gulf between the realm of death and that of life. To that end He became "a partaker of flesh and blood," not to improve flesh and blood, but in order that "through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage" (Heb. 2:14, 15). Having Himself crossed that gulf

He is the Way of life to all who believe on Him, who, having heard His Word—the Word of life—have likewise passed out of death into life (John 5:24).

This is the wonderful provision of God for the deliverance of dying men. In order that they might not die, and because God wills not that any should perish (2 Peter 3:9), He has sent into this dying world a Word of Life. For God is not the God of the dead, but of the living (Matt. 22:32).

In comparison with the provision of divine wisdom, power and grace, from the God who quickeneth the dead (Rom. 4:17), how pitifully foolish and vain are all human schemes for the betterment, reform and cultivation of that old man who has fallen under the sovereignty of death! Men are very ingenious, but none has yet brought forward a scheme for abolishing or escaping death, or for raising the dead. Without that, of what avail are plans of improvement? And what end do they serve but to blind men's minds to the truth that they are dead, and so are beyond all but the power of a God who raises the dead? Surely these schemes are the most successful devices of "the god of this age."

What men need is not morality, but life; not to make death respectable, but to receive the gift of eternal life; not decent interment, but a pathway out of the realm of death. Many men have brought forward their schemes for the "uplift of humanity" (though the results thereof are not yet discernible); but there is only One Man who makes, or ever made, the offer of eternal life. None other has ever said, "I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth on Me though he were dead yet shall he live. And whosoever liveth and believeth on Me shall never die" (John 11:25, 26). He only claims to be the "Fountain of Living Waters" (Jer. 2:13; John 4:14; 7:37), and says to all who are suffering the thirst of death, "Come unto Me and drink" (John 7:37).

Therefore, in concluding these reflections upon the Living Word, we obey the command, "Let him that heareth say,

Come," and would lovingly repeat the last invitation of grace recorded in the Word of Life:

"LET HIM THAT IS ATHIRST COME.
AND WHOSOEVER WILL,
LET HIM TAKE
THE WATER OF LIFE
FREELY."

(Rev. 22:17.)

CHAPTER VIII

IS THERE A GOD?

BY REV. THOMAS WHITELAW, M. A., D. D.,
KILMARNOCK, SCOTLAND

Whether or not there is a supreme personal intelligence, infinite and eternal, omnipotent, omniscient and omnipresent, the Creator, upholder and ruler of the universe, immanent in and yet transcending all things, gracious and merciful, the Father and Redeemer of mankind, is surely the profoundest problem that can agitate the human mind. Lying as it does at the foundation of all man's religious beliefs—as to responsibility and duty, sin and salvation, immortality and future blessedness, as to the possibility of a revelation, of an incarnation, of a resurrection, as to the value of prayer, the credibility of miracle, the reality of providence,—with the reply given to it are bound up not alone the temporal and eternal happiness of the individual, but also the welfare and progress of the race. Nevertheless, to it have been returned the most varied responses.

The Atheist, for example, asserts that there is no God. The Agnostic professes that he cannot tell whether there is a God or not. The Materialist boasts that he does not need a God, that he can run the universe without one. The (Bible) Fool wishes there was no God. The Christian answers that he cannot do without a God.

I. THE ANSWER OF THE ATHEIST

"THERE IS NO GOD"

In these days it will hardly do to pass by this bold and confident negation by simply saying that the theoretical atheist is an altogether exceptional specimen of humanity, and that

his audacious utterance is as much the outcome of ignorance as of impiety. When one meets in the "Hibbert Journal" from the pen of its editor such a statement as this: "Society abounds with earnest and educated persons who have lost faith in a living personal God, and see their fellows and foresee themselves passing out of life entirely without hope," and when Blatchford in the English "Clarion" writes: "There is no Heavenly Father watching tenderly over us, His creatures, He is the baseless shadow of a wistful dream," it becomes apparent that theoretical atheism is not extinct, even in cultured circles, and that some observations with regard to it may still be needful. Let these observations be the following:

1. *Belief that there is no God does not amount to a demonstration that no God is.* Neither, it is true, does belief that God is prove the truth of the proposition except to the individual in whose heart that belief has been awakened by the Divine Spirit. To another than him it is destitute of weight as an argument in support of the theistic position. At the same time it is of importance, while conceding this, to emphasize the fact that disbelief in the existence of a Divine Being is not equivalent to a demonstration that there is no God.

2. *Such a demonstration is from the nature of the case impossible.* Here again it may be true as Kant contends that reason cannot demonstrate (that is, by logic) the existence of God; but it is equally true, as the same philosopher admits, that reason can just as little disprove the existence of God. It was well observed by the late Prof. Calderwood of the Edinburgh University that "the divine existence is a truth so plain that it needs no proof, as it is a truth so high that it admits of none." But the situation is altered when it comes to a positive denial of that existence. The idea of God once formed in the mind, whether as an intuition or as a deduction, cannot be laid aside without convincing evidence that it is delusive and unreal. And such evidence cannot be produced. As Dr. Chalmers long ago observed, before one can positively assert

that there is no God, he must arrogate to himself the wisdom and ubiquity of God. He must explore the entire circuit of the universe to be sure that no God is there. He must have interrogated all the generations of mankind and all the hierarchies of heaven to be certain they had never heard of a God.

In short, as Chalmers puts it, "For man not to know God, he has only to sink beneath the level of our common nature. But to deny God he must be God himself."

3. *Denial of the divine existence is not warranted by inability to discern traces of God's presence in the universe.* Prof. Huxley, who once described himself in a letter to Charles Kingsley as "exactly what the Christian world called, and, so far as he could judge, was justified in calling him, an atheist and infidel," appeared to think it was. "I cannot see," he wrote, "one shadow or tittle of evidence that the Great Unknown underlying the phenomena of the universe stands to us in the relation of a Father, loves us and cares for us as Christianity asserts." Blatchford also with equal emphasis affirms: "I cannot believe that God is a personal God who interferes in human affairs. I cannot see in science, or in experience, or in history, any signs of such a God or of such intervention." Neither of these writers, however, it may be presumed, would on reflection advance their incapacity to perceive the footprints or hear the voices of the Creator as proof that no Creator existed, any more than a blind man would maintain there was no sun because he could not see it, or a deaf man would contend there was no sound because he never heard it. The incapacity of Huxley and Blatchford to either see or hear God may, and no doubt does, serve as an explanation of their atheistical creed, but assuredly it is no justification of the same, since a profounder reasoner than either has said: "The invisible things of God since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even His everlasting power and divinity; so that they [who believe not] are without excuse."

4. *The majority of mankind, not in Christian countries only, but also in heathen lands, from the beginning of the world onward, have believed in the existence of a Supreme Being.* They may frequently, as Paul says, have "changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds and four-footed beasts and creeping things;" but deeply seated in their natures, debased though these were by sin, lay the conception of a Superhuman Power to whom they owed allegiance and whose favor was indispensable to their happiness. It was a saying of Plutarch that in his day a man might travel the world over without finding a city without temples and gods; in our day isolated cases have been cited of tribes—the Andaman Islanders by Sir John Lubbock, and the Fuegians, by Admiral Fitzroy—who have exhibited no signs that they possessed a knowledge either of God or of religion. But it is at least open to question whether the investigators on whose testimony such instances are advanced did not fail to discover traces of what they sought either through want of familiarity with the language of the natives, or through starting with the presupposition that the religious conceptions of the natives must be equally exalted with their own. In any case, on the principle that exceptions prove the rule, it may be set down as incontrovertible that the vast majority of mankind have possessed some idea of a Supreme Being; so that if the truth or falsehood of the proposition, "There is no God," is to be determined by the counting of votes, the question is settled in the negative, that is, against the atheist's creed.

II. THE CONFESSION OF THE AGNOSTIC

"I CANNOT TELL WHETHER THERE IS A GOD OR NOT"

Without dogmatically affirming that there is no God, the Agnostic practically insinuates that whether there is a God or not, nobody can tell and it does not much matter—that man with his loftiest powers of thought and reason and with his

best appliances of research, cannot come to speech with God or obtain reliable information concerning Him, can only build up an imaginary picture, like an exaggerated or overgrown man, and call that God—in other words, can only make a God after his own image and in his own likeness without being sure whether any corresponding reality stands behind it, or even if there is, whether that reality can be said to come up to the measure of a Divine Being or be entitled to be designated God. The agnostic does not deny that behind the phenomena of the universe there may be a Power, but whether there is or not, and if there is, whether that Power is a Force or a Person, are among the things unknown and unknowable, so that practically, God being outside and beyond the sphere of man's knowledge, it can never be of consequence whether there be a God or not—it can never be more than a subject of curious speculation, like that which engages the leisure time of some astronomers, whether there be inhabitants in the planet Mars or not.

As thus expounded, the creed of the agnostic is open to serious objections.

1. *It entirely ignores the spiritual factor in man's nature,* —either denying the soul's existence altogether, or viewing it as merely a function of the body; or, if regarding it as a separate entity distinct from the body, and using its faculties to apprehend and reason about external objects, yet denying its ability to discern spiritual realities. On either alternative, it is contradicted by both Scripture and experience. From Genesis to Revelation the Bible proceeds upon the assumption that man is more than "six feet of clay," "curiously carved and wondrously articulated," that "there is a spirit in man," and that this spirit has power not only to apprehend things unseen but to come into touch with God and to be touched by Him, or, in Scripture phrase, to see and know God and to be seen and known by Him. Nor can it be denied that man is conscious of being more than animated matter, and of having power to apprehend more than comes within the range of his senses, for

he can and does entertain ideas and cherish feelings that have at least no direct connection with the senses, and can originate thoughts, emotions and volitions that have not been excited by external objects. And as to knowing God, Christian experience attests the truth of Scripture when it says that this knowledge is no figure of speech or illusion of the mind, but a sober reality. It is as certain as language can make it that Abraham and Jacob, Moses and Joshua, Samuel and David, Isaiah and Jeremiah, had no doubt whatever that they knew God and were known of Him; and multitudes of Christians exist to-day whom it would not be easy to convince that they could not and did not know God, although not through the medium of the senses or even of the pure reason.

2. *It takes for granted that things cannot be adequately known unless they are fully known.* This proposition, however, cannot be sustained in either Science or Philosophy, in ordinary life or in religious experience. Science knows there are such things as life (vegetable and animal), and force (electricity and magnetism for example), but confesses its ignorance of what life and force are as to their essence—all that is understood about them being their properties and effects. Philosophy can expound the laws of thought, but is baffled to unriddle the secret of thought itself, how it is excited in the soul by nerve-movements caused by impressions from without, and how it can express itself by originating counter movements in the body. In ordinary life human beings know each other adequately for all practical purposes while aware that in each there are depths which the other cannot fathom, each being shut off from the other by what Prof. Dods calls "the limitations of personality." Nor is the case different in religious experience. The Christian, like Paul, may have no difficulty in saying, "Christ liveth in me," but he cannot explain to himself or others, how. Hence the inference must be rejected that because the finite mind cannot fully comprehend the infinite, therefore it cannot know the

infinite at all, and must remain forever uncertain whether there is a God or not. Scripture, it should be noted, does not say that any finite mind can fully find out God; but it does say that men may know God from the things which He has made, and more especially from the Image of Himself which has been furnished in Jesus Christ, so that if they fail to know Him, they are without excuse.

3. *It virtually undermines the foundations of morality.* For if one cannot tell whether there is a God or not, how can one be sure that there is any such thing as morality? The distinctions between right and wrong which one makes in the regulation of his conduct may be altogether baseless. It is true a struggle may be made to keep them up out of a prudential regard for future safety, out of a desire to be on the winning side in case there should be a God. But it is doubtful if the imperative "ought" would long resound within one's soul, were the conclusion once reached that no one could tell whether behind the phenomena of nature or of consciousness there was a God or not. Morality no more than religion can rest on uncertainties.

III. THE BOAST OF THE MATERIALIST

"I DO NOT NEED A GOD, I CAN RUN THE UNIVERSE WITHOUT ONE"

Only grant him to begin with an ocean of atoms and a force to set them in motion and he will forthwith explain the mystery of creation. If we have what he calls a scientific imagination, he will let us see the whole process,—the molecules or atoms circling and whirling, dancing and skipping, combining and dividing, advancing and retiring, selecting partners and forming groups, closing in their ranks and opening them out again, building up space-filling masses, growing hotter and hotter as they wheel through space, whirling swifter and swifter, till through sheer velocity they swell and burst, after which they break up into fragments and cool down into a complete planetary system.

Inviting us to light upon this globe, the materialist will show us how through long centuries, mounting up to millions of years, the various rocks which form the earth's crust were deposited. Nay, if we will dive with him to the bottom of the ocean he will point out the first speck of dead matter that sprang into life, protoplasm, though he cannot tell when or how. Having startled us with this, he will lead us up the Great Staircase of Nature with its 26 or 27 steps, and tell us how on this step the vegetable grew into an animal, and how after many more steps the animal became a man, and thus the whole evolutionary drama will be unrolled.

Concerning this theory of the universe, however, it is pertinent to make these remarks:

1. Taken at its full value, with unquestioning admission of the alleged scientific facts on which it is based, *it is at best only an inference or working hypothesis, which may or may not be true and which certainly cannot claim to be beyond dispute.*

2. So far from securing universal acceptance, *it has been repudiated by scientists of the highest repute.* "The Kant-Laplace theory of the origin of the solar system by the whirling masses of nebulous matter, till rings flew off and became the worlds we see," says a German writer, "can no more be defended by any scientist" (Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift, 1905, p. 957). The attempt to explain in this way the origin of the universe, says Merz, can be described as "belonging to the romance of science" (European Thought in the 19th Cent., p. 285). Indeed Laplace himself put it forward "with great reserve, and only as a likely suggestion" (ibid., p. 285). As regards the derivation of man from the lower animals, it is enough to remember that the late Prof. Virchow maintained that "we cannot designate it as a revelation of science, that man descends from the ape or from any other animal" (Nature, Dec. 8, 1877); that Prof. Paulsen, speaking of Haeckel, says "he belongs already to a dead generation," and calls his theory

of materialistic evolution "an example of incredible frivolity in the treatment of serious problems" (see Princeton Review, Oct., 1906, p. 443); that Prof. Von E. Pfenningsdorf declares "the materialistic explanation of the world to be untenable" (see Theologische Rundschau, 1905, p. 85); that Fleischman in his book, "Die Desendenz Theorie," denies evolution altogether; that Dr. Rudolph Otto admits that "popular Darwinism (Darwinisms Vulgaris)," by which he means "that man is really descended from monkeys," is "theoretically worthless" (Naturalism and Religion, p. 94); and that Prof. Pettigrew of St. Andrew's University writes: "There is, it appears to me, no proof that man is directly descended from the ape, and indirectly from the mollusc or monad" (Design in Nature, Vol. III, p. 1324).

3. *Conceding all that evolutionists demand*, that from matter and force the present cosmos has been developed, *the question remains, whether this excludes or renders unnecessary the intervention of God as the prime mover in the process.* If it does, one would like to know whence matter and force came. For the atoms or molecules, formerly supposed to be ultimates and indivisible, have now been proved by science to be manufactured and capable of being analyzed into myriads of electrons; and it is hardly supposable that they manufactured themselves. Moreover, one would like to know how these atoms or electrons came to attract and repel one another and form combinations, if there was no original cause behind them and no aim before them? If even matter be construed as a form of energy, or force, the difficulty is not removed, since force in its last analysis is the output of will and will implies intelligence or conscious personality.

From this conclusion escape is impossible, except by assuming that matter and force existed from eternity; in which case they must have contained in themselves the germs of life and intelligence—in other words must themselves have been God—in *posse*, if not in *esse*, in potentiality if not in reality.

But against this pantheistical assumption must ever lie the difficulty of explaining how or why the God that was latent in matter or force was so long in arriving at consciousness in man, and how before man appeared, the latent God being unconscious could have directed the evolutionary process which fashioned the cosmos. Till these inquiries are satisfactorily answered, it will not be possible to accept the materialistic solution of the universe.

IV. THE DESIRE OF THE (BIBLE) FOOL

"I WISH THERE WAS NO GOD"

Only a few words need be given to this rejoinder, as the fool does not say in his intellect, but only in his heart, there is no God. In his case the wish is father to the thought. Secretly persuaded in his mind that there is a God, he would much rather there had been none. It would suit him better. But the fact that he cannot advance to a categorical denial of the Divine Existence is an indirect witness to the innate conviction which the human heart possesses, that there is a God in whom man lives and moves and has his being.

V. THE DECLARATION OF THE CHRISTIAN

"I CANNOT DO WITHOUT A GOD, WITHOUT A GOD I CAN NEITHER ACCOUNT FOR THE UNIVERSE AROUND ME, NOR EXPLAIN JESUS CHRIST ABOVE ME, NOR UNDERSTAND THE SPIRITUAL EXPERIENCES WITHIN ME"

1. *Without a God the material universe around the Christian is and remains a perplexing enigma.*

When he surveys that portion of the universe which lies open to his gaze, he sees marks of wisdom, power and goodness that irresistibly suggest the idea of a God. When he looks upon the stellar firmament with its innumerable orbs, and considers their disposition and order, their balancing and circling, he instinctively argues that these shining suns and

systems must have been created, arranged and upheld by a Divine Mind. When, restricting his attention to the earth on which he stands, he notes the indications of design or of adaptation of means to end which are everywhere visible, as witnessed, for example, in the constancy of nature's laws and forces, in the endless variety of nature's forms, inanimate and animate, as well as in their wonderful gradation not only in their kinds but also in the times of their appearing, and in the marvelous adjustment of organs to environment, he feels constrained to reason that these things are not the result of chance which is blind or the spontaneous output of matter, which in itself, so far as known to him, is powerless, lifeless and unintelligent, but can only be the handiwork of a Creative Mind. When further he reflects that in the whole round of human experience, effects have never been known to be produced without causes; that designs have never been known to be conceived or worked out without designers and artificers; that dead matter has never been known to spring into life either spontaneously or by the application of means; that one kind of life has never been known to transmute itself spontaneously or to be transmuted artificially into another, neither a vegetable into an animal, nor an animal into a man; and when lastly, accepting the guidance of science, he perceives that in the upward ascent or evolution of nature dead matter was, after an interval, perhaps of millions of years, followed by vegetable life, and this again by animal existence, and this by man precisely as Scripture asserts, he once more feels himself shut up to the conclusion that the whole cosmos must be the production of mind, even of a Supreme Intelligence infinitely powerful, wise and good. Like the Hebrew psalmist he feels impelled to say, "O Lord! how manifold are Thy works: in wisdom hast Thou made them all!"

Should the philosopher interject, that this argument does not necessarily require an Infinite Intelligence but only an artificer capable of constructing such a universe as the present,

the answer is that if such an artificer existed he himself would require to be accounted for, since beings that are finite must have begun to be, and therefore must have been caused.

Accordingly this artificer must have been preceded by another greater than himself, and that by another still greater, and so on travelling backwards forever. Hence it was argued by Kant that pure reason could not demonstrate the existence of God, but only of a competent demiurge or world-builder. But this reasoning is fallacious. The human mind cannot rest in an endless succession of effects without a First Cause, like a chain depending from nothing. Kant himself seemed to recognize the unsatisfactory character of his logic, since, after casting out God from the universe as Creator, he sought to bring Him in again as Supreme Moral Governor.

But if man's moral nature cannot be explained without a Supreme Moral Lawgiver, on what principle can it be reasoned that man's intellectual nature demands less than a Supreme Intelligence?

2. *Without a God the Christian cannot explain to himself the Person of Jesus.*

Leaving out of view what the Gospels report about His virgin birth (though we do not regard the narratives as unhistorical or the fact recorded as incredible), and fixing attention solely on the four records, the Christian discerns a personality that cannot be accounted for on ordinary principles. It is not merely that Jesus performed works such as none other man did, and spoke words such as never fell from mortal lips; it is that in addition His life was one of incomparable goodness—of unwearied philanthropy, self-sacrificing love, lowly humility, patient meekness and spotless purity—such as never before had been witnessed on earth, and never since has been exhibited by any of His followers. It is that Jesus, being such a personality as described by those who beheld His glory to be that of an only-begotten from a Father, full of grace and truth, put forth such pretensions and claims

as were wholly unfitting in the lips of a mere man, and much more of a sinful man, declaring Himself to be the Light of the World and the Bread of Life: giving out that He had power to forgive sins and to raise the dead; that He had pre-existed before He came to earth and would return to that pre-existent state when His work was done, which work was to die for men's sins; that He would rise from the dead and ascend up into heaven, both of which He actually did; and asserting that He was the Son of God, the equal of the Father and the future Judge of mankind. The Christian studying this picture perceives that, while to it belong the lineaments of a man, it also wears the likeness of a God, and he reasons that if that picture was drawn from the life (and how otherwise could it have been drawn?) then a God must once have walked this earth in the person of Jesus. For the Christian no other conclusion is possible. Certainly not that of the New Theology, which makes of Jesus a sinful man, distinguishing Him from Christ, the so-called ideal figure of the creeds, and calling Him divine only in the sense that other men are divine though in a lesser degree than He. But even the New Theology cannot escape from the implication of its own creed. For if Jesus was the divinest man that ever lived on earth, then naturally His Word should carry more weight than that of any other, and He taught emphatically, not only that there was a personal God whose Son He was, but that men should pray: "Our Father which art in Heaven."

3. *Without a God the Christian cannot understand the facts of his own consciousness.*

Take first the idea of God of which he finds himself possessed on arriving at the age of intelligence and responsibility. How it comes to pass that this great idea should arise within him if no such being as God exists, is something he cannot understand. To say that he has simply inherited it from his parents or absorbed it from his contemporaries is not to solve the problem, but only to put it back from generation to gen-

eration. The question remains, How did this idea first originate in the soul? To answer that it gradually grew up out of totemism and animism as practiced by the low-grade races who, impelled by superstitious fears, conceived material objects to be inhabited by ghosts or spirits, is equally an evasion of the problem. Because again the question arises, How did these low-grade races arrive at the conception of spirits as distinguished from bodies or material objects in general? Should it be responded that veneration for deceased ancestors begat the conception of a God, one must further demand by what process of reasoning they were conducted from the conception of as many gods as there were deceased ancestors to that of one Supreme Deity or Lord of all. The only satisfactory explanation of the latent consciousness of God which man in all ages and lands has shown himself to be possessed of is, that it is one of the soul's intuitions, a part of the intellectual and moral furniture with which it comes into the world; that at first this idea or intuition lies within the soul as a seed corn which gradually opens out as the soul rises into full possession of its powers and is appealed to by external nature; that had sin not entered into the world this idea or intuition would have everywhere expanded into full bloom, filling the soul with a clear and radiant conception of the Divine Being, in whose image it has been made; but that now in consequence of the blighting influence of sin this idea or intuition has been everywhere more or less dimmed and weakened and in heathen nations corrupted and debased.

Then rising to the distinctly religious experience of conversion, the Christian encounters a whole series or group of phenomena which to him are inexplicable, if there is no God. Conscious of a change partly intellectual but mainly moral and spiritual, a change so complete as to amount to an inward revolution, what Scripture calls a new birth or a new creation, he cannot trace it to education or to environment, to philosophical reflection or to prudential considerations.

The only reasonable account he can furnish of it is that he has been laid hold of by an unseen but Superhuman Power, so that he feels constrained to say like Paul: "By the grace of God I am what I am." And not only so, but as the result of this inward change upon his nature, he realizes that he stands in a new relation to that Supreme Power which has quickened and renewed him, that he can and does enter into personal communion with Him through Jesus Christ, addressing to Him prayers and receiving from Him benefits and blessings in answer to those prayers.

These experiences of which the Christian is conscious may be characterized by the non-Christian as illusions, but to the Christian they are realities; and being realities they make it simply impossible for him to believe there is no God. Rather they inspire him with confidence that God is, and is the Rewarder of them that diligently seek Him, and that of Him and through Him and to Him are all things; to whom be glory for ever. Amen.

CHAPTER IX

GOD IN CHRIST THE ONLY REVELATION OF THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD

BY ROBERT E. SPEER

"They shall put you out of the synagogues: yea, the hour cometh, that whosoever killeth you shall think that he offereth service unto God. And these things will they do, because they have not known the Father nor me." (*John 16:2, 3.*)

These words suggest to us that it is not enough for a man just to believe in God. Everything depends on what kind of a god it is in whom he believes. It is a rather striking and surprising comparison at first that our Lord institutes here between a mere belief in God and the possibly horrible moral consequences, on the one hand, and a knowledge of God in Christ and its sure moral effects, on the other. And the lesson would seem to be the inadequacy of any religious faith that does not recognize the revelation of the Father in Jesus Christ and that does not know Jesus Christ as God. It is a little hard for us to take such a great thought as this into our lives, and yet our Lord puts it in unmistakable clearness: on the one hand, the moral inadequacy of a mere belief in God; on the other hand, the moral and spiritual adequacy of a recognition of God as Father exposed in Christ as God.

THEISM NOT SUFFICIENT

In the former of these two verses our Lord makes the first of these two points unmistakably clear. He saw no adequate guarantee of moral rectitude and justice in a mere theistic faith. He suffered in His own death the possibly bitter fruits of a mere theistic faith. The men who put Him to death were ardent believers in God, and they thought they

were doing a fine thing for God when they crucified the Son of God. And He told His disciples that the day would come when conscientious men would take out service of God in executing them, and that those who would put them to death would not be bad men, but men who thought that by killing them they were doing God's will.

We see exactly the same great error in our own day. It is no sufficient protection to a man to believe in one God. There are no more rigid monotheists in the world than Mohammedans, and there are some who tell us that in India the moral conditions of the Mohammedans are even worse than the moral conditions of the polytheistic Hindus around about them. It is not so much a matter of how many gods you believe in. I would rather believe in three good gods than in one bad one. One religion is superior to another religion, not because it has less or more gods than that other religion, but because the character of its gods is superior to the character of the gods of that other religion. Our Lord understood completely that a mere faith in God was not going to make a good man, that a man might believe in God and be a murderer, or an adulterer, he might believe in God and put the very apostles of Jesus Christ to death and think that thus he was doing God a great service.

CONSCIENTIOUSNESS NOT SUFFICIENT

It seems to me that it is worth while to stop here for a moment incidentally to note how easy a thing it is for a man to be guilty of conscientious error and crime. It is no defense of a man's conduct to say that he is conscientiously satisfied with what he did. I suppose that most bad things have been done in all good conscience, and that most of the sins that we commit today we commit with a perfectly clean conscience. There is such a thing as a moral color-blindness that is just as real as a physical color-blindness. I was visiting a little while ago one of our well-known girls' schools, and had

a discussion with one of the teachers, who said that she thought it did not make so much difference what a pupil believed or did, provided only she was conscientious in her belief and conduct. I told her that it must be quite easy to go to school to her if it did not matter whether you answered right or not, if only you were conscientiously honest in what you said. She might get two absolutely contrary answers to a question and mark each one of them perfect. The whole foundations of the moral universe fall out from beneath the man or the woman who will take that view of it, that there is not really any objective standard of right or wrong at all, that everything hinges on just how a person feels about it, and if they only feel comfortable over the thing it is all right. These men who were going to put the disciples of Jesus Christ to death had no qualms of conscience about it. They would think in doing it that they were doing God a service. The idea that our Lord means to bring out is this, that the standards of a man are dependent upon his conception of God, and He saw no guarantee of moral rectitude and justice in a man's life except as that man grasped the revelation of God as Father that had been made in Jesus Christ, and himself knew Jesus Christ as God.

CHRIST'S MENTION OF "FATHER"

There is no room here to trace this great thought through all the teaching of our Lord, but it would be a good and helpful thing if many of us would take the four Gospels and sit down with two sheets of paper, and write down on one sheet everything that Jesus had to say about *the Father*, and on the other every mention in Christ's teaching of the name of *God*. Lately, I read through the last discourses of Jesus in John with this in mind. Only four times does Jesus so much as mention the name of God, while He speaks of the Father at least forty times. Evidently our Lord conceived that His great message to men was a message of God as Father revealed in

His own life, and He conceived this to be a great practical moral truth, that was to save men from those errors of judgment, of act and of character about which a man has no sure guarantee under a mere monotheistic faith.

IN RELATION TO OUR RELIGIOUS FAITH

1. I think we might just as well now go right to the heart of the thing by considering, first of all, THE RELATIONSHIP OF THIS REVELATION THAT JESUS CHRIST MADE OF THE FATHER-CHARACTER OF GOD IN HIMSELF TO OUR OWN RELIGIOUS FAITH. We begin our Christian creed with the declaration, "I believe in God the Father Almighty." I believe that no man can say those words sincerely and honestly, with an intellectual understanding of what he is saying, who is not saying them with his feet solidly resting on the evangelical conviction; for we know practically nothing about God *as* Father except what we learn from the revelation of God as Father in Jesus Christ. Men say sometimes that the idea of God as Father was in the Old Testament, and there is a sense doubtless in which we can find it there: a patriotic sense for one thing, a poetic sense for another thing. The Hebrews thought of God as the Father, the national Father of Israel.

Now and then there is some splendid burst in the prophets that contains that idea, as when Jeremiah, crying out for God, says, "I am a Father to Israel, and Ephraim is my firstborn." Or when Israel is itself crying out through Isaiah, "Jehovah is our Father. He is the potter and we are the clay." But in each sense it is a sort of nationalistic conception of God as the Father of the whole people Israel. And even when the note comes out poetically, it is patriotic still. Turn some time to the 103rd Psalm, where there is the best expression of it, "Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him," and even there it is the national cry. Or turn to the 89th Psalm, and there, too, it is national and patriotic: "And he shall cry unto me, Jehovah,

thou art my Father, my God, and the rock of my salvation." And if in all the great body of the religious poetry of Israel there are only two or three distinct notes of the fatherhood of God, we cannot believe that that idea filled any very large place in the heart of Israel. And in the very last of all the Old Testament prophecies, the complaint of God is just this, that the Israelites would not conceive of Him as their Father, and that even the political conception of God as the Father of the nation was no reality in the experience of the people.

A NEW CONCEPTION

The revelation of God as the Father of men was a practically new conception exposed in the teaching and in the life of our Lord Jesus Christ—not in His teaching alone. We should never have known God as Father by the message of Jesus Christ only; we should never have been able to conceive what Christ's idea of God was if we had not seen that idea worked out in the very person of Jesus Christ Himself. It was not alone that He told us what God was. He said that when He walked before men, He was Himself one with the Father on Whom the eyes of men might gaze: "I am the way, and the truth, and the life: no one cometh unto the Father, but by me. If ye had known me, ye would have known my Father also; from henceforth ye have known Him and have seen Him. Philip saith unto Him, Lord show us the Father, and it sufficeth us. Jesus said unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and dost thou not know me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; how sayest thou, Show us the Father? Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The words that I say unto you I speak not from myself: but the Father abiding in me doeth His works."

JOHN AND MATTHEW

We cannot separate the Christological elements of the Gospel from the Gospel. The effort is made by throwing the

Gospel of John out of court, and then we are told that with the Gospel of John gone the real work of Christ was just in His message, making known the Father to men, and that the Christological character that we impose upon the Gospel was something foisted upon it later, and not something lying in the mind and thought of Jesus Christ Himself. But I do not see how men can take that view of it until they cut out also the 11th chapter of Matthew. Christ sets forth there the essentially Christological character of His gospel just as unmistakably as it is set forth anywhere in the Gospel of John: "No man knoweth the Son save the Father; and no man knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him." What I mean is just this, that the only defense of the Unitarian position is a ripping of the Gospel apart so that you cannot recognize it as the Gospel any more. You cannot tear Christ's revelation of the fatherhood of God away from the person of Christ. He did not expose the fatherhood of God by what He said; He exposed the fatherhood of God by what He was; and it is a species of intellectual misconception to take certain words of His and say those words entitle us to believe in God as our Father, while we reject Jesus Christ as His Divine Son, and think that it is possible to hold to the first article of our Christian creed without going on to the second article of it, "And I believe in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord."

CHRIST IS ALL

If you and I subtract from our conception of God what we owe to the person of Jesus Christ, we have practically nothing left. The disciples knew that they would have little left. When it was proposed that they should separate themselves from Christ and the revelation that He was making, these men stood absolutely dumbfounded. "Why, Lord," they said, "what is to become of us? We have no place to go. Thou hast the words of eternal life. There is nothing for us in

Judaism any more." Monotheism was in Judaism; the revelation of God was in Judaism; but that was nothing to the disciples now that they had seen that glorious vision of His Father made known to men in Jesus Christ His Son. It would seem to follow that our attitude towards Jesus Christ is determinative of our life in the Father, and that the imagination that we have a life in the Father that rests on a rejection of the claims of Jesus Christ is an imagination with no foundations under it at all. Take those great words of our Lord: "He that loveth me not keepeth not my words; and the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's who sent me. If a man love me, he will keep my word: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him." All through these last discourses of Jesus you come upon the two terms, "word" and "words." In the Greek they are not just the singular and the plural of the same word. The word that is translated "word" here is the same word that in the beginning of this Gospel is translated "word," *logos,* which does not mean the utterances of Jesus, which does not mean the things that Jesus said, which does not mean the ideals of life that Jesus erected. We are not complying with that condition when we try to be kind and unselfish and to obey the Golden Rule. What Jesus is setting forth there as the condition of a right attitude toward God is a man's acceptance of the inner secret of His own life, a man's deliberate committing of himself to the great principles that underlie the character and the person of Jesus, a sympathetic union with Himself. And He summed it all up in those words to Philip, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." It is in this sense, I say, that you and I cannot honestly declare that we "believe in God the Father" unless we go right on to say, "And in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord," for we know practically nothing about God as Father except what was revealed of God as Father in Him Who said, "I and the Father are one." Do we believe in the fatherhood of God in that sense?

PRACTICAL APPLICATION

2. Perhaps we can answer that question better by going on to ask, in the second place, whether we are REALIZING IN OUR LIVES ALL THE PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THIS REVELATION OF THE FATHER-CHARACTER OF GOD IN JESUS CHRIST. For one thing, think how it *interprets the mystery and the testing of life*. Now life is simply an enigma on the merely theistic hypothesis. We get absolutely no comfort, no light, no illumination upon what we know to be the great problem of life from a simple belief in God. It only becomes intelligible to us as we understand God to be our Father in the sense in which Jesus Christ revealed Him. Dr. Babcock used to put it in the simple phrase: "You have got to take one of two interpretations of it. You have got to read your life in the terms of fate, or you have got to read it in the terms of fatherhood." Once I accept the revelation of God made in Jesus Christ, my life is still a hard problem to me. There are many things in it that are terribly confused and difficult still; but I begin to get a little light on its deep and impenetrable mysteries. It was just in this point of view that the writer of the great epistle to the Hebrews thought he had some clue to the mystery of his own life, to the chastening of it, to the hard and burning discipline through which he sees we are all passing. It was only when he conceived of himself as being a son of the great Potter Who was shaping the clay Himself that the mystery began to clear a little from his pathway. And it was just so, you remember, that Christ got light on the mystery of His life: "Father, not my will, but thine be done." Only as He remembered and rested deeply upon the character of God as His Father did those great experiences through which He was passing have full intelligibility to Him. After all, it was no fancy that connected the two great ideas of Isaiah, the living idea of the fatherhood of God and the metaphorical idea of God as the Potter shaping his clay. It is only

so that we understand both aspects of our human life. We turn to Rabbi Ben Ezra and see the mystery wrought out there:

"He fixed thee mid this dance
Of plastic circumstance,
This Present, thou, forsooth, wouldst fain arrest:
Machinery just meant
To give thy soul its bent.
Try thee and turn thee forth, sufficiently impressed."

When the wheel moves fast, and the hand of the Potter seems cruel upon the clay, and the friction is full of terrible heat, we begin to understand something of it all in realizing that the Potter's hand is the hand of a Father shaping in fatherly discipline the life of His son. "If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as sons."

OUR IDEALS

Or think, in the second place, how this conception of God *inspires and rectifies the ideals of our lives.* It was this that suggested the idea to Jesus here. He saw that there was absolutely no guarantee of right standards of life in a mere theistic faith, and there are none. We cannot morally trust Unitarianism if we take it away from living contact with the evangelical tradition. There is too much loose, subjective caprice in it; there is not enough firm and unassailable anchorage in the objective realities of a revelation of the character of God made known to us in His divine Son. We have no guarantee whatever of just and perfect moral ideals that we do not get from the exposure of the father-character of God in the person of Jesus Christ and from personal union with God in Him.

As a simple matter of fact the best ideals of our life we all owe to just that revelation. The ideal of purity—the Jews never had it. They had an ideal of ritual cleanliness, but they had no Christian ideal of moral purity. You cannot find

the ideal of purity anywhere in the world where the conception of the father-revelation of God in Christ has not gone. Explain it as you will, it is a simple fact of comparative religion. Can any man find the full ideal of moral purity anywhere in this world where it has not been created by the revelation of the father-character of God in Christ? We owe it to that, and we can not be sure of its perpetuation save where the conviction of that great revelation abides in the faith of man.

Or take our ideal of work. Where did Christ get His ideal of work? "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." On what ground did He rest His claim upon men to work? "Son, go work today in my vineyard." Our whole ideal of a workingman's life, of a man's using his life to the fullness of its power in an unselfish service is an ideal born of the revelation of the father-character of God in Christ. And forgiveness is an ideal of the same kind. We owe all the highest and noblest ideals of our life to that revelation. And it seems to us something less than fair for a man to take those ideals and then deny their origin, trampling under foot the claims of Him from Whom those ideals came into our lives.

SWEETENS OBEDIENCE

And think *how rational and sweet this conception of God makes obedience.* There is something rational but hardly sweet in the thought of obedience to Him under the simple theistic conception. All the joy of obedience comes when I think of myself as my Father's son and sent to do my Father's will. Our Lord thought of His life just so. "Simon," He said—that last night that Simon tried to defend Him by force—"put up thy sword into its sheath. The cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?" We get our ideals of obedience and the joy and the delight of obedience from the thought that after all we are simply to obey our Father. In the 14th chapter of the Gospel of John, we get a little vision of what Christ conceives to be the sweetness and the tender-

ness and the beauty that can come into life from a real acceptance of this revealing of His. "In that day," He says, "ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you. He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him and will manifest myself unto him. If a man love me, he will keep my word; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him."

I remember an interview I had some years ago at Asheville. As we sat under the trees, the man with whom I was talking told me he had had a home; he was sure it was the sweetest home that could be found in all the Southern States; and he did not have it any more. The eye that had marked his coming and brightened when he came watched for him no more, and little arms that had been thrown around his neck, and that made his home-coming in the evening a very taste of heaven to him, were no longer there to greet him, nor any little voice to call to him as he came. And he told me that when first that great eclipse fell upon his life it seemed to him that the whole thing was done and that a man was not warranted in trying to live any more. But he found here in this 14th chapter of John these great assurances of which I have just been speaking, that there was another eye that could take the place of that eye that had waited in the years that had passed, other arms that could take the place of those little arms that were now busy with the other children round about the throne of God in heaven. There had come back into life the tenderness—and mark you, that too is a thought that came when Jesus Christ revealed the Father in Himself—there had come back into his life the tenderness and the joy and the gentleness that he had known before, simply because now he had come a little more fully to realize what it was that Jesus Christ by His life and teachings had exposed for the life of man.

COURAGE AND HOPE

And what *new courage and hope* it brings into a man's life. You say to me, "Man, you have got to be like God," and I reply, "Take your preposterous blasphemy away. To be like God?" But you say to me, "He is your own Father, and you are His son. We are not asking you to become like that to which you are essentially unlike; we are simply asking you to become like your Father. It is His own nature in you that He will develop until restored to its full relationship to Him from Whom it came." You talk to us that way about our duty as men in the world, and it makes all the difference between death and life to us. If God the Father did not come near to men in Jesus Christ, I do not know what I am going to do; I do not know where to find the help that I know I need. Nowhere else in the world has any voice arisen to offer it to men. But if God came near men in Jesus Christ and thereby guaranteed our own kinship to Him, I may believe that I can become like Him Whose son I am. It is on just this ground that St. Paul makes his appeal: "Be ye therefore imitators of God *as dear children.*"

RELATION TO PRAYER LIFE

3. And, last of all, think on THE LIGHT THAT THIS CONCEPTION OF GOD THROWS UPON OUR LIFE OF PRAYER. I suspect that prayer has been just a sham to many of us, or a thing that we have done because other people told us it was the thing to do. We never got anything out of it; it never meant anything to us. We might just as well have talked to stone walls as to pray the way we have prayed. We went out and said, "God," and we might just as well have said, "hills," or "mountains," or "trees," or anything else. Why have we not gone into the school of Christ and learned there, alike from His practice and His doctrine, what real prayer is and how a man can do it. You cannot find a single prayer of Christ addressed to God, not one; nor can you find a single

prayer of Christ's in which He so much as mentions God. The third verse of the 17th chapter of John, which says, "And this is eternal life, that they might believe in thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent," may be an exception, but you will find that Westcott, and others of the best New Testament commentators, regard that phrase as a parenthesis of John the Evangelist, and not part of our Lord's great prayer.

I hope I am not misunderstood. I am meaning only that Christ's conception of God and His practice of prayer did not rest merely on the theistic interpretation of the universe and the nature of its Creator in His majesty and almightiness. They rested on the father conception which He revealed in Himself. Just run over in your thought His prayers: the prayer that He taught us to pray, "Our Father, who art in heaven;" the prayer He offered Himself when the disciples of John the Baptist came to Him: "I thank thee, Father, lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hidden these things from the wise and the understanding, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father, for it seemeth good in thy sight;" the prayer that He offered in the temple, when Philip and Andrew came to Him with the message about the Greeks who were seeking to see Him: "Now is my soul troubled, and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour? But for this cause came I unto this hour;" the prayer that He offered before the grave of Lazarus, "Father, I thank thee that thou hearest me, and I know that thou hearest me always;" the prayer that He put up in Gethsemane, "My Father, if this cup cannot pass from me except I drink it, thy will be done;" and the last prayer of all, when, as a tired little child, He lay down in His Father's arms and fell asleep: "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." He never pushed God off into His almightiness; not once in all His life of supplication can you find Him dealing with God in this way. He never smote the heart with the chill of the divine

attributes. You may be recalling, perhaps, that one cry of His from the cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"—a quotation from one of the Psalms and a shout of victory. I think that could be demonstrated to be a shout of victory and not a cry of isolation; but that alone would be your exception. All the other times it was, "Father," "my Father," "holy Father," "righteous Father"—sometimes, we may believe, in the quiet intimacy of His secret consciousness, "my dear Father." What a reality this conception of prayer gives to it. We are not praying to any cold theistic God alone; we are praying to our Father made real to us, warm with the warmth of a great tenderness for us, living with a great consciousness of all our human suffering and struggle and conflict and need.

It makes prayer, for one thing, a rational thing. I can go to my Father and ask Him for the things that I need. There is an exquisite passage in Andrew Bonar's journals in which he speaks of sitting one day in his study and looking out of his window and seeing two of his children pass through the fields. He said as he saw those little children making their way across the fields, the love in his heart overcame him, and he pushed his books away from him on the table, and went to the door and called out across the field to them, and they came running eagerly in response to their father's loving call. And when they had come, and he had caressed them, he said he gave each one of them something simply because the ecstasy of his fatherly love made it impossible that he should not do something then for those two children who were so dear to his heart. Do you suppose that God is an inferior sort of a father? Do you suppose that there are impulses in us toward our children, or in our fathers toward us, that are not simply just the dim and the faded suggestion of nobler and diviner impulses of the father heart of God? Prayer in the sense of supplication for real things becomes a rational reality to men who believe in God in Jesus Christ.

FELLOWSHIP

And how sweet it makes prayer in the sense of living fellowship. Do you suppose that we are nobler characters than that great Father after Whom these human fatherhoods of ours are named? Do you suppose that if it is sweet to us to have our little children come creeping to us in the dark, it is not sweet to our heavenly Father here, everywhere, to have men, His sons, come stealing to His side and His love? This is no excessive way of putting it. Is it not guaranteed to us by those words which our Lord spoke that Easter morning as He stood there by His open grave, and the woman who adored Him was about to clasp His feet, "Mary, go and tell my disciples that I ascend unto my Father, and your Father, my God and your God." Yes, that is the right way to put it today. No God for us, nowhere through the whole universe a real and satisfying God for us, except the God Who is discovered to us in Jesus Christ, and Who is calling to us today by the lips of Christ, "My son, O my son," and Who would have us call back to Him, if we be true men, "My Father, O my Father."

CHAPTER X

THE DEITY OF CHRIST.

BY PROF. BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD, D. D., LL. D.,
PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

A recent writer has remarked that our assured conviction of the deity of Christ rests, not upon "proof-texts or passages, nor upon old arguments drawn from these, but upon the general fact of the whole manifestation of Jesus Christ, and of the whole impression left by Him upon the world." The antithesis is too absolute, and possibly betrays an unwarranted distrust of the evidence of Scripture. To make it just, we should read the statement rather thus: Our conviction of the deity of Christ rests not alone on the scriptural passages which assert it, but also on His entire impression on the world; or perhaps thus: Our conviction rests not more on the scriptural assertions than upon His entire manifestation. Both lines of evidence are valid; and when twisted together form an unbreakable cord. The proof-texts and passages do prove that Jesus was esteemed divine by those who companied with Him; that He esteemed Himself divine; that He was recognized as divine by those who were taught by the Spirit; that, in fine, He was divine. But over and above this Biblical evidence the impression Jesus has left upon the world bears independent testimony to His deity, and it may well be that to many minds this will seem the most conclusive of all its evidences. It certainly is very cogent and impressive.

EXPERIENCE AS PROOF.

The justification which the author we have just quoted gives of his neglecting the scriptural evidence in favor of that borne by Jesus' impression on the world is also open to criticism. "Jesus Christ," he tells us, "is one of those essential

truths which are too great to be proved, like God, or freedom, or immortality." Such things rest, it seems, not on proofs but on experience. We need not stop to point out that this experience is itself a proof. We wish rather to point out that some confusion seems to have been fallen into here between our ability to marshal the proof by which we are convinced and our accessibility to its force. It is quite true that "the most essential conclusions of the human mind are much wider and stronger than the arguments by which they are supported;" that the proofs "are always changing but the beliefs persist." But this is not because the conclusions in question rest on no sound proofs; but because we have not had the skill to adduce, in our argumentative presentations of them, the really fundamental proofs on which they rest.

UNCONSCIOUS RATIONALITY.

A man recognizes on sight the face of his friend, or his own handwriting. Ask him how he knows this face to be that of his friend, or this handwriting to be his own, and he is dumb, or, seeking to reply, babbles nonsense. Yet his recognition rests on solid grounds, though he lacks analytical skill to isolate and state these solid grounds. We believe in God and freedom and immortality on good grounds, though we may not be able satisfactorily to analyse these grounds. No true conviction exists without adequate rational grounding in evidence. So, if we are solidly assured of the deity of Christ, it will be on adequate grounds, appealing to the reason. But it may well be on grounds not analysed, perhaps not analysable, by us, so as to exhibit themselves in the forms of formal logic.

We do not need to wait to analyse the grounds of our convictions before they operate to produce convictions, any more than we need to wait to analyse our food before it nourishes us; and we can soundly believe on evidence much mixed with error, just as we can thrive on food far from pure. The alchemy of the mind, as of the digestive tract, knows how to

separate out from the mass what it requires for its support; and as we may live without any knowledge of chemistry, so we may possess earnest convictions, solidly founded in right reason, without the slightest knowledge of logic. The Christian's conviction of the deity of his Lord does not depend for its soundness on the Christian's ability convincingly to state the grounds of his conviction. The evidence he offers for it may be wholly inadequate, while the evidence on which it rests may be absolutely compelling.

TESTIMONY IN SOLUTION.

The very abundance and persuasiveness of the evidence of the deity of Christ greatly increases the difficulty of adequately stating it. This is true even of the scriptural evidence, as precise and definite as much of it is. For it is a true remark of Dr. Dale's that the particular texts in which it is definitely asserted are far from the whole, or even the most impressive, proofs which the Scriptures supply of our Lord's deity. He compares these texts to the salt-crystals which appear on the sand of the sea-beach after the tide has receded. "These are not," he remarks, "the strongest, though they may be the most apparent, proofs that the sea is salt; the salt is present in solution in every bucket of sea-water." The deity of Christ is in solution in every page of the New Testament. Every word that is spoken of Him, every word which He is reported to have spoken of Himself, is spoken on the assumption that He is God. And that is the reason why the "criticism" which addresses itself to eliminating the testimony of the New Testament to the deity of our Lord has set itself a hopeless task. The New Testament itself would have to be eliminated. Nor can we get behind this testimony. Because the deity of Christ is the presupposition of every word of the New Testament, it is impossible to select words out of the New Testament from which to construct earlier documents in which the deity of Christ shall not be assumed. The assured

conviction of the deity of Christ is coëval with Christianity itself. There never was a Christianity, neither in the times of the Apostles nor since, of which this was not a prime tenet.

A SATURATED GOSPEL.

Let us observe in an example or two how thoroughly saturated the Gospel narrative is with the assumption of the deity of Christ, so that it crops out in the most unexpected ways and places.

In three passages of Matthew, reporting words of Jesus, He is represented as speaking familiarly and in the most natural manner in the world, of "*His* angels" (13:41; 16:27; 24:31). In all three He designates Himself as the "Son of man"; and in all three there are additional suggestions of His majesty. "The Son of man shall send forth *His* angels, and they shall gather out of *His* kingdom all things that cause stumbling and those that do iniquity, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire."

Who is this Son of man who has angels, by whose instrumentality the final judgment is executed at His command? "The Son of man shall come in the glory of His Father with *His* angels; and then shall *He* reward every man according to his deeds." Who is this Son of man surrounded by His angels, in whose hands are the issues of life? The Son of man "shall send forth *His* angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together *His* elect from the four winds from one end of heaven to the other." Who is this Son of man at whose behest His angels winnow men? A scrutiny of the passages will show that it is not a peculiar body of angels which is meant by the Son of man's angels, but just the angels as a body, who are His to serve Him as He commands. In a word, Jesus Christ is above angels (Mark 13:32)—as is argued at explicit length at the beginning of the Epistle to the Hebrews. "To which of the angels said he at any time, Sit on my right hand, etc." (Heb. 1:13).

HEAVEN COME TO EARTH.

There are three parables recorded in the fifteenth chapter of Luke as spoken by our Lord in His defence against the murmurs of the Pharisees at His receiving sinners and eating with them. The essence of the defence which our Lord offers for Himself is, that there is joy *in heaven* over repentant sinners! Why "in heaven," "before the throne of God"? Is He merely setting the judgment of heaven over against that of earth, or pointing forward to His future vindication? By no means. He is representing His action in receiving sinners, in seeking the lost, as His proper action, because it is the normal conduct of heaven, manifested in Him. He is heaven come to earth. His defence is thus simply the unveiling of what the real nature of the transaction is. The lost when they come to Him are received because this is heaven's way; and *He* cannot act otherwise than in heaven's way. He tacitly assumes the good Shepherd's part as His own.

THE UNIQUE POSITION.

All the great designations are not so much asserted as assumed by Him for Himself. He does not call Himself a prophet, though He accepts this designation from others: He places Himself above all the prophets, even above John the greatest of the prophets, as Him to whom all the prophets look forward. If He calls Himself Messiah, He fills that term, by doing so, with a deeper significance, dwelling ever on the unique relation of Messiah to God as His representative and His Son. Nor is He satisfied to represent Himself merely as standing in a unique relation to God: He proclaims Himself to be the recipient of the divine fullness, the sharer in all that God has (Matt. 11:28). He speaks freely of Himself indeed as God's Other, the manifestation of God on earth, whom to have seen was to have seen the Father also, and who does the work of God on earth. He openly claims divine prerogatives—

the reading of the heart of man, the forgiveness of sins, the exercise of all authority in heaven and earth. Indeed, all that God has and is He asserts Himself to have and be; omnipotence, omniscience, perfection belong as to the one so to the other. Not only does He perform all divine acts; His self-consciousness coalesces with the divine consciousness. If His followers lagged in recognizing His deity, this was not because He was not God or did not sufficiently manifest His deity. It was because they were foolish and slow of heart to believe what lay patently before their eyes.

THE GREAT PROOF.

The Scriptures give us evidence enough, then, that Christ is God. But the Scriptures are far from giving us all the evidence we have. There is, for example, the revolution which Christ has wrought in the world. If, indeed, it were asked what the most convincing proof of the deity of Christ is, perhaps the best answer would be, just Christianity. The new life He has brought into the world; the new creation which He has produced by His life and work in the world; here are at least His most palpable credentials.

Take it objectively. Read such a book as Harnack's "The Expansion of Christianity," or such an one as Von Dobschütz's "Christian Life in the Primitive Church"—neither of which allows the deity of Christ—and then ask, Could these things have been wrought by power less than divine? And then remember that these things were not only wrought in that heathen world two thousand years ago, but have been wrought over again every generation since; for Christianity has reconquered the world to itself each generation. Think of how the Christian proclamation spread, eating its way over the world like fire in the grass of a prairie. Think how, as it spread, it transformed lives. The thing, whether in its objective or in its subjective aspect, were incredible, had it not actually occurred. "Should a voyager," says Charles Darwin,

"chance to be on the point of shipwreck on some unknown coast, he will most devoutly pray that the lesson of the missionary may have reached thus far. The lesson of the missionary is the enchanter's wand." Could this transforming influence, undiminished after two millenniums, have proceeded from a mere man? It is historically impossible that the great movement which we call Christianity, which remains unspent after all these years, could have originated in a merely human impulse; or could represent today the working of a merely human force.

THE PROOF WITHIN.

Or take it subjectively. Every Christian has within himself the proof of the transforming power of Christ, and can repeat the blind man's syllogism: Why herein is the marvel that ye know not whence He is, and yet He opened my eyes. "Spirits are not touched to fine issues who are not finely touched." "Shall we trust," demands an eloquent reasoner, "the touch of our fingers, the sight of our eyes, the hearing of our ears, and not trust our deepest consciousness of our higher nature—the answer of conscience, the flower of spiritual gladness, the glow of spiritual love? To deny that spiritual experience is as real as physical experience is to slander the noblest faculties of our nature. It is to say that one half of our nature tells the truth, and the other half utters lies. The proposition that facts in the spiritual region are less real than facts in the physical realm contradicts all philosophy." The transformed hearts of Christians, registering themselves "in gentle tempers, in noble motives, in lives visibly lived under the empire of great aspirations"—these are the ever-present proofs of the divinity of the Person from whom their inspiration is drawn.

The supreme proof to every Christian of the deity of his Lord is then his own inner experience of the transforming power of his Lord upon the heart and life. Not more surely

does he who feels the present warmth of the sun know that the sun exists, than he who has experienced the re-creative power of the Lord know Him to be his Lord and his God. Here is, perhaps we may say the proper, certainly we must say the most convincing, proof to every Christian of the deity of Christ; a proof which he cannot escape, and to which, whether he is capable of analysing it or drawing it out in logical statement or not, he cannot fail to yield his sincere and unassailable conviction. Whatever else he may or may not be assured of, he knows that his Redeemer lives. Because He lives, we shall live also—that was the Lord's own assurance. Because we live, He lives also—that is the ineradicable conviction of every Christian heart.

CHAPTER XI

THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF CHRIST.

BY THE REV. PROF. JAMES ORR, D. D.,
UNITED FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW, SCOTLAND.

It is well known that the last ten or twenty years have been marked by a determined assault upon the truth of the Virgin birth of Christ. In the year 1892 a great controversy broke out in Germany, owing to the refusal of a pastor named Schrempf to use the Apostles' Creed in baptism because of disbelief in this and other articles. Schrempf was deposed, and an agitation commenced against the doctrine of the Virgin birth which has grown in volume ever since. Other tendencies, especially the rise of an extremely radical school of historical criticism, added force to the negative movement. The attack is not confined, indeed, to the article of the Virgin birth. It affects the whole supernatural estimate of Christ—His life, His claims, His sinlessness, His miracles, His resurrection from the dead. But the Virgin birth is assailed with special vehemence, because it is supposed that the evidence for this miracle is more easily got rid of than the evidence for public facts, such as the resurrection. The result is that in very many quarters the Virgin birth of Christ is openly treated as a fable. Belief in it is scouted as unworthy of the twentieth century intelligence. The methods of the oldest opponents of Christianity are revived, and it is likened to the Greek and Roman stories, coarse and vile, of heroes who had gods for their fathers. A

special point is made of the silence of Paul, and of the other writings of the New Testament, on this alleged wonder.

THE UNHAPPIEST FEATURE.

It is not only, however, in the circles of unbelief that the Virgin birth is discredited; in the church itself the habit is spreading of casting doubt upon the fact, or at least of regarding it as no essential part of Christian faith. This is the unhappiest feature in this unhappy controversy. Till recently no one dreamed of denying that, in the sincere profession of Christianity, this article, which has stood from the beginning in the forefront of all the great creeds of Christendom, was included. Now it is different. The truth and value of the article of the Virgin birth are challenged. The article, it is affirmed, did not belong to the earliest Christian tradition, and the evidence for it is not strong. Therefore, let it drop.

THE COMPANY IT KEEPS.

From the side of criticism, science, mythology, history and comparative religion, assault is thus made on the article long so dear to the hearts of Christians and rightly deemed by them so vital to their faith. For loud as is the voice of denial, one fact must strike every careful observer of the conflict. Among those who reject the Virgin birth of the Lord few will be found—I do not know any—who take in other respects an adequate view of the Person and work of the Saviour. It is surprising how clearly the line of division here reveals itself. My statement publicly made and printed has never been confuted, that those who accept a full doctrine of the incarnation —that is, of a true entrance of the eternal Son of God into our nature for the purposes of man's salvation—with hardly an exception accept with it the doctrine of the Virgin birth of Christ, while those who repudiate or deny this article of faith either hold a lowered view of Christ's Person, or, more commonly, reject His supernatural claims altogether. It will

not be questioned, at any rate, that the great bulk of the opponents of the Virgin birth—those who are conspicuous by writing against it—are in the latter class.

A CAVIL ANSWERED.

This really is an answer to the cavil often heard that, whether true or not, the Virgin birth is not of essential importance. It is not essential, it is urged, to Christ's sinlessness, for that would have been secured equally though Christ had been born of two parents. And it is not essential to the incarnation. A hazardous thing, surely, for erring mortals to judge of what was and was not essential in so stupendous an event as the bringing in of the "first-begotten" into the world! But the Christian instinct has ever penetrated deeper. Rejection of the Virgin birth seldom, if ever, goes by itself. As the late Prof. A. B. Bruce said, with denial of the Virgin birth is apt to go denial of the virgin life. The incarnation is felt by those who think seriously to involve a miracle in Christ's earthly origin. This will become clearer as we advance.

THE CASE STATED.

It is the object of this paper to show that those who take the lines of denial on the Virgin birth just sketched do great injustice to the evidence and importance of the doctrine they reject. The evidence, if not of the same public kind as that for the resurrection, is far stronger than the objector allows, and the fact denied enters far more vitally into the essence of the Christian faith than he supposes. Placed in its right setting among the other truths of the Christian religion, it is not only no stumbling-block to faith, but is felt to fit in with self-evidencing power into the connection of these other truths, and to furnish the very explanation that is needed of Christ's holy and supernatural Person. The ordinary Christian is a witness here. In reading the Gospels, he feels no incongruity in passing from the narratives of the Virgin birth to the won-

derful story of Christ's life in the chapters that follow, then from these to the pictures of Christ's divine dignity given in John and Paul. The whole is of one piece: the Virgin birth is as natural at the beginning of the life of such an One—the divine Son—as the resurrection is at the end. And the more closely the matter is considered, the stronger does this impression grow. It is only when the scriptural conception of Christ is parted with that various difficulties and doubts come in.

A SUPERFICIAL VIEW.

It is, in truth, a *very superficial* way of speaking or thinking of the Virgin birth to say that nothing depends on this belief for our estimate of Christ. Who that reflects on the subject carefully can fail to see that if Christ was virgin born—if He was truly "conceived," as the creed says, "by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary"—there must of necessity enter a supernatural element into His Person; while, if Christ was sinless, much more, if He was the very Word of God incarnate, there must have been a miracle—the most stupendous miracle in the universe—in His origin? If Christ was, as John and Paul affirm and His church has ever believed, the Son of God made flesh, the second Adam, the new redeeming Head of the race, a miracle was to be expected in His earthly origin; without a miracle such a Person could never have been. Why then cavil at the narratives which declare the fact of such a miracle? Who does not see that the Gospel history would have been incomplete without them? Inspiration here only gives to faith what faith on its own grounds imperatively demands for its perfect satisfaction.

THE HISTORICAL SETTING.

It is time now to come to *the Scripture itself*, and to look at the fact of the Virgin birth in its historical setting, and its relation with other truths of the Gospel. As preceding the

examination of the historical evidence, a little may be said, first, on the *Old Testament preparation.* Was there any such preparation? Some would say there was not, but this is not God's way, and we may look with confidence for at least some indications which point in the direction of the New Testament event.

THE FIRST PROMISE.

One's mind turns first to that *oldest of all evangelical promises,* that the seed of the woman would bruise the head of the serpent. "I will put enmity," says Jehovah to the serpent-tempter, "between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; he shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel" (Genesis 3:15. R. V.). It is a forceless weakening of this first word of Gospel in the Bible to explain it of a lasting feud between the race of men and the brood of serpents. The serpent, as even Dr. Driver attests, is "the representative of the power of evil"—in later Scripture, "he that is called the Devil and Satan" (Rev. 12:9)—and the defeat he sustains from the woman's seed is a moral and spiritual victory. The "seed" who should destroy him is described emphatically as the *woman's* seed. It was the woman through whom sin had entered the race; by the seed of the woman would salvation come. The early church writers often pressed this analogy between Eve and the Virgin Mary. We may reject any element of over-exaltation of Mary they connected with it, but it remains significant that this peculiar phrase should be chosen to designate the future deliverer. I cannot believe the choice to be of accident. The promise to Abraham was that in *his* seed the families of the earth would be blessed; there the *male* is emphasized, but here it is the *woman*—the woman distinctively. There is, perhaps, as good scholars have thought, an allusion to this promise in 1 Timothy 2:15, where, with allusion to Adam and Eve, it is said, "But she shall be saved through her (or the) child-bearing" (R. V.).

THE IMMANUEL PROPHECY.

The idea of the Messiah, gradually gathering to itself the attributes of a divine King, reaches one of its clearest expressions in *the great Immanuel prophecy,* extending from Isaiah 7 to 9:7, and centering in the declaration: "The Lord Himself will give you [the unbelieving Ahaz] a sign; behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel" (Isa. 7:14; Cf. 8:8, 10). This is none other than the child of wonder extolled in chapter 9:6, 7: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, [Father of Eternity], The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom," etc. This is the prophecy quoted as fulfilled in Christ's birth in Matt. 1:23, and it seems also alluded to in the glowing promises to Mary in Luke 1:32, 33. It is pointed out in objection that the term rendered "virgin" in Isaiah does not necessarily bear this meaning; it denotes properly only a young unmarried woman. The context, however, seems clearly to lay an emphasis on the unmarried state, and the translators of the Greek version of the Old Testament (the Septuagint) plainly so understood it when they rendered it by *parthenos,* a word which *does* mean "virgin." The tendency in many quarters now is to admit this (Dr. Cheyne, etc.), and even to seek an explanation of it in alleged Babylonian beliefs in a virgin-birth. This last, however, is quite illusory.[1] It is, on the other hand, singular that the Jews themselves do not seem to have applied this prophecy at any time to the Messiah—a fact which disproves the theory that it was this text which suggested the story of a Virgin birth to the early disciples.

[1]For the evidence, see my volume on "The Virgin Birth," Lecture VII.

ECHOES IN OTHER SCRIPTURES.

It was, indeed, when one thinks of it, only on the supposition that there was to be something exceptional and extraordinary in the birth of this child called Immanuel that it could have afforded to Ahaz a sign of the perpetuity of the throne of David on the scale of magnitude proposed ("Ask it either in the depth, or in the height above." Ver. 10). We look, therefore, with interest to see if there are any *echoes* or *suggestions* of the idea of this passage in other prophetic scriptures. They are naturally not many, but they do not seem to be altogether wanting. There is, first, the remarkable Bethlehem prophecy in Micah 5:2, 3—also quoted as fulfilled in the nativity (Matt. 2:5, 6)—connected with the saying: "Therefore will he give them up, until the time that she who travaileth hath brought forth" ("The King from Bethlehem," says Delitzsch, "who has a nameless one as mother, and of whose father there is no mention"). Micah was Isaiah's contemporary, and when the close relation between the two is considered (Cf. Isa. 2:2-4, with Micah 4:1-3), it is difficult not to recognize in his oracle an expansion of Isaiah's. In the same line would seem to lie the enigmatic utterance in Jer. 31:22: "For Jehovah hath created a new thing in the earth: a woman shall encompass a man" (thus Delitzsch, etc.).

TESTIMONY OF THE GOSPEL.

The germs now indicated in phophetic scriptures had apparently borne no fruit in Jewish expectations of the Messiah, when *the event took place* which to Christian minds made them luminous with predictive import. In Bethlehem of Judea, as Micah had foretold, was born of a virgin mother He whose "goings forth" were "from of old, from everlasting" (Micah 5:2; Matt. 2:6). Matthew, who quotes the first part of the verse, can hardly have been ignorant of the hint of pre-existence it contained. This brings us to the testimony to the miraculous birth of Christ in our first and third Gospels—the

only Gospels which record the circumstances of Christ's birth at all. By general consent the narratives in Matthew (chapters 1, 2) and in Luke (chapters 1, 2) are independent—that is, they are not derived one from the other—yet they both affirm, in detailed story, that Jesus, conceived by the power of the Holy Spirit, was born of a pure virgin, Mary of Nazareth, espoused to Joseph, whose wife she afterwards became. The birth took place at Bethlehem, whither Joseph and Mary had gone for enrollment in a census that was being taken. The announcement was made to Mary beforehand by an angel, and the birth was preceded, attended, and followed by remarkable events that are narrated (birth of the Baptist, with annunciations, angelic vision to the shepherds, visit of wise men from the east, etc.). The narratives should be carefully read at length to understand the comments that follow.

THE TESTIMONY TESTED.

There is no doubt, therefore, about the testimony to the Virgin birth, and the question which now arises is—What is the *value* of these parts of the Gospels as evidence? Are they genuine parts of the Gospels? Or are they late and untrustworthy additions? From what sources may they be presumed to be derived? It is on the truth of the narratives that our belief in the Virgin birth depends. Can they be trusted? Or are they mere fables, inventions, legends, to which no credit can be attached?

The answer to several of these questions can be given in very brief form. The narratives of the nativity in Matthew and Luke are undoubtedly *genuine parts* of their respective Gospels. They have been there since ever the Gospels themselves had an existence. The proof of this is convincing. The chapters in question are found in every manuscript and version of the Gospels known to exist. There are hundreds of manuscripts, some of them very old, belonging to different parts of the world, and many versions in different languages (Latin, Syriac,

Egyptian, etc.), but these narratives of the Virgin birth are found in all. We know, indeed, that a section of the early Jewish Christians—the Ebionites, as they are commonly called —possessed a Gospel based on Matthew from which the chapters on the nativity were absent. But this was not the real Gospel of Matthew: it was at best a mutilated and corrupted form of it. The genuine Gospel, as the manuscripts attest, always had these chapters.

Next, as to the Gospels themselves, they were not of late and non-apostolic origin; but were *written by apostolic men,* and were from the first accepted and circulated in the church as trustworthy embodiments of sound apostolic tradition. Luke's Gospel was from Luke's own pen—its genuineness has recently received a powerful vindication from Prof. Harnack, of Berlin—and Matthew's Gospel, while some dubiety still rests on its original language (Aramaic or Greek), passed without challenge in the early church as the genuine Gospel of the Apostle Matthew. Criticism has more recently raised the question whether it is only the "groundwork" of the discourses (the "Logia") that comes directly from Matthew. However this may be settled, it is certain that the Gospel in its Greek form always passed as Matthew's. It must, therefore, if not written by him, have had his immediate authority. The narratives come to us, accordingly, with high apostolic sanction.

SOURCES OF THE NARRATIVES.

As to the *sources* of the narratives, not a little can be gleaned from the study of their internal character. Here two facts reveal themselves. The first is that the narrative of Luke is based on some old, archaic, highly original Aramaic writing. Its Aramaic character gleams through its every part. In style, tone, conception, it is highly primitive—emanates, apparently, from that circle of devout people in Jerusalem to whom its own pages introduce us (Luke 2:25, 36-38). It has, there-

fore, the highest claim to credit. The second fact is even more important. A perusal of the narratives shows clearly—what might have been expected—that the information they convey was derived from no lower source than Joseph and Mary themselves. This is a marked feature of contrast in the narratives—that Matthew's narrative is all told from Joseph's point of view, and Luke's is all told from Mary's. The signs of this are unmistakable. Matthew tells about Joseph's difficulties and action, and says little or nothing about Mary's thoughts and feelings. Luke tells much about Mary—even her inmost thoughts—but says next to nothing directly about Joseph. The narratives, in short, are not, as some would have it, contradictory, but are independent and complementary. The one supplements and completes the other. Both together are needed to give the whole story. They bear in themselves the stamp of truth, honesty, and purity, and are worthy of all acceptation, as they were evidently held to be in the early church.

UNFOUNDED OBJECTIONS.

Against the acceptance of these early, well-attested narratives, what, now, have the objectors to allege? I pass by the attempts to show, by critical elimination (expurging Luke 1:35, and some other clauses), that Luke's narrative was not a narrative of a Virgin birth at all. This is a vain attempt in face of the testimony of manuscript authorities. Neither need I dwell on the alleged "discrepancies" in the genealogies and narratives. These are not serious, when the independence and different standpoints of the narratives are acknowledged. The genealogies, tracing the descent of Christ from David along different lines, present problems which exercise the minds of scholars, but they do not touch the central fact of the belief of both Evangelists in the birth of Jesus from a virgin. Even in a Syriac manuscript which contains the certainly wrong reading, "Joseph begat Jesus," the narrative goes on,

as usual, to recount the Virgin birth. It is not a contradiction, if Matthew is silent on the earlier residence in Nazareth, which Luke's object led him fully to describe.

SILENCE OF MARK AND JOHN.

The objection on which most stress is laid (apart from what is called the evidently "mythical" character of the narratives) is the *silence* on the Virgin birth in the remaining Gospels, and other parts of the New Testament. This, it is held, conclusively proves that the Virgin birth was not known in the earliest Christian circles, and was a legend of later origin. As respects the Gospels—Mark and John—the objection would only apply if it was the design of these Gospels to narrate, as the others do, the circumstances of the nativity. But this was evidently not their design. Both Mark and John knew that Jesus had a human birth—an infancy and early life—and that His mother was called Mary, but of deliberate purpose they tell us nothing about it. Mark begins his Gospel with Christ's entrance on His public ministry, and says nothing of the period before, especially of how Jesus came to be called "the Son of God" (Mark 1:1). John traces the divine descent of Jesus, and tells us that the "Word became flesh" (John 1:14); but how this miracle of becoming flesh was wrought he does not say. It did not lie within his plan. He knew the church tradition on the subject: he had the Gospels narrating the birth of Jesus from the Virgin in his hands: and he takes the knowledge of their teaching for granted. To speak of contradiction in a case like this is out of the question.

SILENCE OF PAUL.

How far Paul was acquainted with the facts of Christ's earthly origin it is not easy to say. To a certain extent these facts would always be regarded as among the privacies of the innermost Christian circles—so long at least as Mary lived—and the details may not have been fully known till the Gospels

were published. Paul admittedly did not base his preaching of his Gospel on these private, interior matters, but on the broad, public facts of Christ's ministry, death, and resurrection. It would be going too far, however, to infer from this that Paul had no knowledge of the miracle of Christ's birth. Luke was Paul's companion, and doubtless shared with Paul all the knowledge which he himself had gathered on this and other subjects. One thing certain is, that Paul could not have believed in the divine dignity, the pre-existence, the sinless perfection, and redeeming headship, of Jesus as he did, and not have been convinced that His entrance into humanity was no ordinary event of nature, but implied an unparalleled miracle of some kind. This Son of God, who "emptied" Himself, who was "born of a woman, born under the law," who "knew no sin" (Phil. 2:7, 8; Gal. 4:4; 2 Cor. 5:21), was not, and could not be, a simple product of nature. God must have wrought creatively in His human origin. The Virgin birth would be to Paul the most reasonable and credible of events. So also to John, who held the same high view of Christ's dignity and holiness.

CHRIST'S SINLESSNESS A PROOF.

It is sometimes argued that a Virgin birth is no aid to the explanation of Christ's *sinlessness*. Mary being herself sinful in nature, it is held the taint of corruption would be conveyed by one parent as really as by two. It is overlooked that the whole fact is not expressed by saying that Jesus was born of a virgin mother. There is the other factor—"conceived by the Holy Ghost." What happened was a divine, creative miracle wrought in the production of this new humanity which secured, from its earliest germinal beginnings, freedom from the slightest taint of sin. Paternal generation in such an origin is superfluous. The birth of Jesus was not, as in ordinary births, the creation of a new personality. It was a divine Person—already existing—entering on this new mode of exist-

ence. Miracle could alone effect such a wonder. *Because* His human nature had this miraculous origin Christ was the "holy" One from the commencement (Luke 1:35). Sinless He was, as His whole life demonstrated; but when, in all time, did natural generation give birth to a sinless personality?

THE EARLY CHURCH A WITNESS.

The history of the early church is occasionally appealed to in witness that the doctrine of the Virgin birth was not primitive. No assertion could be more futile. The early church, so far as we can trace it back, in all its branches, held this doctrine. No Christian sect is known that denied it, save the Jewish Ebionites formerly alluded to. The general body of the Jewish Christians—the Nazarenes as they are called—accepted it. Even the greater Gnostic sects in their own way admitted it. Those Gnostics who denied it were repelled with all the force of the church's greatest teachers. The Apostle John is related to have vehemently opposed Cerinthus, the earliest teacher with whom this denial is connected.

DISCREDITED VAGARIES.

What more remains to be said? It would be waste of space to follow the objectors into their various theories of a *mythical* origin of this belief. One by one the speculations advanced have broken down, and given place to others—all equally baseless. The newest of the theories seeks an origin of the belief in ancient Babylonia, and supposes the Jews to have possessed the notion in pre-Christian times. This is not only opposed to all real evidence, but is the giving up of the contention that the idea had its origin in *late* Christian circles, and was unknown to earlier apostles.

THE REAL CHRIST.

Doctrinally, it must be repeated that the belief in the Virgin birth of Christ is of the highest value for the right apprehension of Christ's unique and sinless personality. Here is

One, as Paul brings out in Romans 5:12 ff., who, free from sin Himself, and not involved in the Adamic liabilities of the race, reverses the curse of sin and death brought in by the first Adam, and establishes the reign of righteousness and life. Had Christ been naturally born, not one of these things could be affirmed of Him. As one of Adam's race, not an entrant from a higher sphere, He would have shared in Adam's corruption and doom—would Himself have required to be redeemed. Through God's infinite mercy, He came from above, inherited no guilt, needed no regeneration or sanctification, but became Himself the Redeemer, Regenerator, Sanctifier, for all who receive Him. "Thanks be unto God for His unspeakable gift" (2 Cor. 9:15).

CHAPTER XII

THE GOD-MAN*

BY THE LATE JOHN STOCK

Jesus of Nazareth was not mere man, excelling others in purity of life and conduct and in sincerity of purpose, simply distinguished from other teachers by the fullness of His knowledge. *He is the God-man.* Such view of the person of Messiah is the assured foundation of the entire Scriptural testimony to Him, and it is to be irresistibly inferred from the style and strain in which He habitually spake of Himself. Of this inferential argument of the Saviour we can give here the salient points only in briefest presentation.

1. *Jesus claimed to be the Son of God.* We meet with this title in the Book of Daniel. It was used by Nebuchadnezzar to describe that fourth wonderful personage who walked with the three Hebrew confessors in the fire (3:25), and who was, doubtless, the Lord Jesus Christ revealing Himself in an assumed bodily form to His heroic servants. This majestic title is repeatedly appropriated to Himself by our Master. (See John 5:25; 9:35; 11:4, etc.) In His interview with Nicodemus He designated Himself, *"The Only Begotten Son of God"* (John 3:18).

When confronted with the Sanhedrim, Jesus was closely questioned about His use of this title; and He pleaded guilty to the indictment. (See Matt. 26:63, 64, and 27:43; cf. Luke 22:70, 71, and John 19:7.) It is clear from the narrative that the Jews understood this glorious name in the lips of Jesus to be a blasphemous assertion of divine attributes for Himself.

They understood Jesus to thus claim *equality with God*

*Abbreviated and published by permission of the American Baptist Publication Society.

(see John 5:18); and to *make Himself God.* (See John 10:33.) Did they understand Him? Did they overestimate the significance of this title as claimed by our Lord? How easy it would have been for Him to set them right. How imperative were His obligations to do so, not merely to Himself, but to these unhappy men who were thirsting for His blood under a misapprehension. Did not every principle of philanthropy require Him to save them from the perpetration of the terrible murder which He knew they were contemplating? Yes, if they were mistaken, it was a heinous crime in our Lord not to undeceive them. But not a word did He say to soften down the offensiveness of His claim. He allowed it to stand in all its repulsiveness to the Jewish mind, and died without making any sign that He had been misapprehended. He thus accepted the Jewish interpretation of His meaning, and sealed that sense of the title, *Son of God,* with His heart's blood. Nothing can be clearer, then, than the fact that Jesus died without a protest for claiming equality with God, and thus making Himself God. We dare not trust ourselves to write what we must think of Him under such circumstances, if He were a mere man.

2. *Jesus, on several occasions, claimed a divine supremacy in both worlds.* Take for example His description of the final judgment: "The Son of man shall send forth His angels, and they shall gather out of His kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity: and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth" (Matt. 13:41). The kingdom is His, and all the angels of God are His obedient servants.

He declared in the plainest terms that He will preside as the Universal Judge at the last great day, and that His wisdom and authority will award to every man his appropriate doom. "When the Son of man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the throne of His

glory; and before Him shall be gathered all nations; and He shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats; and He shall set the sheep on His right hand, but the goats on the left" (Matt. 25:31-33). His voice will utter the cheering words, "Come, ye blessed," and the awful sentence, "Depart, ye cursed" (Matt. 25:31-46). Without hesitation, equivocation, or compromise Jesus of Nazareth repeatedly assumed the right and the ability to discriminate the moral character and desserts of all mankind from Adam to the day of doom. His sublime consciousness of universal supremacy relieved the claim of everything like audacity, and only made it the natural sequence of His incarnate Godhead. "All power," He said, "is given unto Me in heaven and in earth" (Matt. 28:18).

This idea germinated in the minds of His followers and apostles. The vivid picture recorded in the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew gave a coloring to all their subsequent thoughts about their divine Master. They ever after spake of Him as "ordained to be the Judge of the quick and the dead" (Acts 10:42; 17:31). They testified that "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad" (2 Cor. 5:10; Rom. 14:10).

Thus the mind of John the Apostle was prepared for the subsequent revelations of Patmos, when he heard his glorified Lord claim to "have the keys of hell and of death" (Rev. 1:18), and saw the vision of the "great white throne, and Him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away" (Rev. 20:11).

But who is this that claims to grasp and wield the thunderbolts of eternal retribution; who professes to be able to scrutinize the secret purposes and motives, as well as the words and deeds, of every man that has been born, from the first dawn of personal responsibility to the day of death? Can anything short of indwelling omniscience qualify Him for such

an intricate and complicated and vast investigation? If He could not search *"the reins and the hearts"* (to use His own words to John), how could He give to every one of us according to his works? (Rev. 2:23.) The brain reels when we think of the tremendous transactions of the last day, and the momentous interests then to be decided forever and ever; and reason tells us, that if the Judge who is to preside over these solemnities be a man, He must be a God-man. If Jesus is to be the universal and absolute Judge of our race—a Judge from whose decisions there will be no appeal, He must be "God manifest in the flesh." But what can we think of Him, if in setting up this claim He mislead us?

3. *Jesus always claimed absolute and indisputable power in dealing with every question of moral duty and destiny.* To quote Mr. Newman, the mere deist, "I find Jesus Himself to set up oracular claims. I find an assumption of pre-eminence and unapproachable moral wisdom to pervade every discourse from end to end of the Gospels. If I may not believe that Jesus assumed an oracular manner, I do not know what moral peculiarity in Him I am permitted to believe."* There is no possibility of denying the truth of these words. Jesus claimed to be absolute Lord in the whole region of morals. He settled the meaning and force of old laws, and instituted new ones by His own authority. Take the Sermon on the Mount as an illustration. With what a self-possessed peremptoriness does He define the existing legislation of God, and enlarge its limits! With what conscious dignity does He decide every question in the whole range of human duty with the simple—"But I say unto you!" Seven times in one chapter does he use this formula. (See Matt. 5:20, 22, 28, 32, 34, 39, 44.) And in the application of the sermon He declared Him only to be the wise man and built upon solid rock, who hears His sayings and does them. (Matt. 7:24.) Well might the people be aston-

*In "Phases of Faith," by Francis William Newman, M. A., page 150.

ished at His doctrine; for verily "He taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes" (Matt. 7:28, 29). But the tone which pervades the Sermon on the Mount runs through the whole of the teaching of Jesus of Nazareth. He ever speaks as if He were the Author and Giver of the law; as if He had the power to modify any of its provisions according to His own ideas of fitness; and as if He were the Supreme Lord of human consciences. His style is utterly unlike that of any inspired teacher before or after Him. They appealed to the law and to the testimony. (See Isa. 8:20.) But Jesus claimed an inherent power to modify and to alter both.

The Sabbath was the symbol of the entire covenant made by God with Israel through the ministry of Moses. (See Exod. 31:12-17.) But Jesus asserted His complete supremacy over this divine institution. These were His emphatic words: *"For the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath day"* (Matt. 12:8; Mark 2:28; Luke 6:5). He could, of His own will, relax the terrors of the Jewish Sabbath, and even supersede it altogether by the Christian "Lord's Day." He was Lord of all divine institutions.

And in the Church He claims the right to regulate her doctrines and her ordinances according to His will. The apostles He commissioned to baptize in His name, and charged them to teach their converts to observe all things whatsoever He had commanded them. (Matt. 28:19-20.) Thus John was prepared for the sublime vision of the Son of man as "He that holdeth the seven stars in His right hand, who walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks" (Rev. 2:1); and as "He that hath the key of David, He that openeth, and no man shutteth; and shutteth, and no man openeth" (Rev. 3:7).

And the authority which Jesus claimed extends into heaven, and to the final state of things. He affirmed that He would ascend to share His Father's dominion, and to sit in the throne of His glory. (See Matt. 19:28.) The counterpart to which announcement is found in His declaration to John in Patmos:

"to him that overcometh will I grant to sit with Me in My throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with My Father in His throne" (Rev. 3:21). The manner in which the Lord spake of Himself in connection with the heavenly state bore much fruit in the hearts and sentiments of His disciples. To them this life was being "absent from the Lord" as to His visible presence: and their one beautiful idea of heaven was that it was being "present with the Lord" (2 Cor. 5:6, 8). He had taught them to regard Him as their "all in all," even in their eternal state; and with unquestioning faith they cherished the one blessed hope of being forever with the Lord. All other ideas of the celestial world were lost sight of in comparison with this absorbing anticipation.

The very mansions which they were to occupy in the Eternal Father's house, Jesus said, He would assign to them (John 14:2). He asserted His right to give away the crowns and glories of immortal blessedness as if they were His by indisputable right. He wills it, and it is done. He constantly reminded His disciples of rewards which He would give to every servant whom, at His coming, He found to be faithful. (Compare Matt. 24:44 with 45, 46, 47; 25:14-46, etc.)

It is true Jesus will give these honors only to those for whom they are prepared by His Father; for, in their designs of mercy, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are *one*. Still He will, of right, dispense the blessing to all who receive it. For these were our Lord's true words: "To sit on My right hand, and on My left, is not Mine to give, but [or, except] it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of My Father" (Matt. 20:23). The language logically implies our Lord's absolute right to give the crowns; but only to such as are appointed to these honors by the Father.

These ideas are repeated in vision to John. Jesus gives "right to the tree of life" (Rev. 2:7). In the praises of the redeemed host, as described in that marvelous Apocalypse, they ever ascribe their salvation and glory to Jesus, and the sinless

angels swell the chorus of Immanuel's praises, while the universe, from its myriad worlds, echoes the strain. (Rev. 5:8-14.)

In the description of the final state of things—a state which shall be subsequent to the millennium (whatever that may be)—(Rev. 20:1-10), and also to the final judgment of both righteous and wicked (Rev. 20:11-15), and to the act of homage and fealty described in 1 Cor. 15:24-28, we find the Lamb still and forever on the throne. The Church is still "the bride, the Lamb's wife" (Rev. 21:9). In that consummated state of all things, "The Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it" (Rev. 21:22), the glory of God lightens it, "and the Lamb is the light thereof" (Rev. 21:23), the pure river of water of life still flows from beneath the throne of God and of the Lamb (Rev. 22:1), "the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it; and His servants shall serve Him: and they shall see His face; and His name shall be in their foreheads" (Rev. 22:3, 4). Throughout the Apocalypse we never find Jesus among the worshippers. He is there the worshipped One on the throne, and with that picture the majestic vision closes.

The inspired apostles had imbibed these ideas from the personal teaching of their Lord, and subsequent revelations did but expand in their minds the seed-thoughts which He had dropped there from His own sacred lips. Paul nobly expressed the sentiments of all his brethren when he wrote, "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love His appearing" (2 Tim. 4:8). But surely He who claims supremacy, absolute and indisputable, in morals, in divine institutions, in the Church on earth, in heaven, and in a consummated universe forever, must be Lord of all, manifest in human form. If he were not, *what* must He have been to advance such assumptions, and what must the book be which enforces them?

4. *Jesus asserted His full possession of the power to forgive sins.* The moral instincts of the Jews were right when they put the question, "Who can forgive sins but God only?" (Mark 2:7.) We do not wonder that, with their ideas of Christ, they asked in amazement, "Who is this that forgiveth sins also?" (Luke 7:49), or that they exclaimed, in reference to such a claim, from such a quarter, "This man blasphemeth" (Matt. 9:3).

And yet Christ declared most emphatically, on more than one occasion, His possession of this divine prerogative, and healed the palsied man in professed attestation of the fact. (Luke 5:24.) Those who would eliminate the miraculous element from the second narrative altogether, must admit that Matthew, Mark, and Luke all relate most circumstantially that Jesus did at least profess to work a miracle in support of His claim to possess power to forgive sins. If He wrought the miracle, His claim is established; and if He did not work it, but cheated the people, then away with Him forever as an arrant impostor! But if He wrought it, and proved His claim, He must be equal with His Father; for the Jews were right, and no one "can forgive sins but God only." Could a mere man cancel with a word the sin of a creature against his Maker? The very thought is a blasphemy.

5. *Jesus claimed the power to raise His own body from the grave, to quicken the souls of men into spiritual life, and to raise all the dead at the last great day.* Jesus likened His body to a temple which the Jews should destroy, and which He would raise up again in three days. (John 2:19-21.) He affirmed that He had power to lay down His life, and power to take it up again. (John 10:18.) He decleared that the *spiritually* dead—for the physical resurrection is spoken of afterward as a distinct topic—should hear His voice and live. (John 5:25.) And then He tells us not to wonder at this, for the day is coming when, by His omnific fiat, all the generations of the dead "shall come forth; they that have done good, unto

the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation" (John 5:28, 29).

But if Jesus were not, in some mysterious sense, the Lord of His own life, what power had He to dispose of it as He pleased? And how could He recall it when gone? And how could he communicate spiritual life, if He were not its Divine Fountain? And how could He raise the dead from their graves, if He were not the Almighty Creator? All these claims, if genuine, necessitate faith in the Godhead of Jesus.

6. *Jesus declared that He had the ability to do all His Father's works.* The Saviour had healed the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda on the Sabbath day. When accused by the Jews of sin for this act, our Lord justified Himself by the ever-memorable words, "My Father worketh hitherto [that is, on the Sabbath day in sustaining and blessing the worlds], and I work"—on the same day, *therefore,* in healing the sick,—thus indirectly asserting His right to do all that His Father did, and, as the Jews put it, claiming *such* a Sonship as made Him "equal with God." But our Lord did not abate one iota of His claim. True, He admitted that, *as the Incarnate Mediator,* He had received His authority from the Father, but He declared that "What things soever the Father doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise" (John 5:17-19). Now, no language can overestimate the sublimity of this claim. Christ affirmed that He possessed full right and ability to do all that the Eternal Father had the right and ability to do. Was such language ever used by the most inspired or the most daring of mere mortals? We do not forget that our Lord was careful to declare that the Father had committed all judgment to Him (John 5:22), but had He not Himself been a partaker of the Godhead how could He, as the Incarnate One, have been qualified to be armed with the prerogative so vast? He who can do all the works of God must be God!

7. *Jesus spake of Himself as the greatest gift of infinite mercy even.* In His conversation with Nicodemus, Christ

spake of Himself in these terms: "God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him, should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 3:16), by which our Lord evidently meant to convey the idea that the gift of the Son was the richest gift of divine love.

And this idea proved powerfully germinant in the minds of the apostles. They elaborated the argument. By the gift of Christ above all others, they taught us: "God commended His love towards us" (Rom. 5:8; see, too, John 4:10). They reasoned thus, having learned their logic from the lips of their Lord, "He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?" (Rom. 8:32). The argument of the apostle is *from the greater to the less.* It assumes that Christ Jesus is greater than all things. It would have no force on any other principle. More than this, it assumes that Christ is *infinitely* greater than all things, so that all the other expressions of divine goodness to our race dwindle into insignificance when compared with the gift of Christ. But can such representations as these be harmonized with the notion that Christ is merely a gifted man? Would they not deserve to be called *hyperbole run mad* on such an hypothesis? And imagine a mere man to stand forward and proclaim himself the choicest gift of God's love to our race. What a monstrous exaggeration and egotism! If Christ be greater than all other divine gifts combined, must He not be the God-man? On the evangelical hypothesis such representations are seen to be neither bombast nor rhetorical exaggeration, but sober, solid truth; and we can say with the seraphic Paul, without reserve: "Thanks be unto God for His *unspeakable* gift" (2 Cor. 9:15).

8. *Jesus announced Himself as the center of rest for the human soul.* Who has not thrilled under the mighty spell of those mighty words: "Come unto Me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and *I* will give you rest. Take My yoke upon you, and learn of Me; for I am meek and lowly in heart; and

ye shall find rest unto your souls. For My yoke is easy and My burden is light" (Matt. 11:28-30). In this invitation our Lord proclaims Himself to be everything to the soul. We are to come to Him, to take His yoke upon us, and to learn of Him. In receiving *Him* we shall find rest unto our souls, for *He* will give us rest.

Now, God alone is the resting-place of the human spirit. In Him, and in Him only, can we find assured peace. But Jesus claims to be our rest. Must He not, then, be God Incarnate? And very noticeable is the fact that, in the same breath in which He speaks of Himself in these august terms, He says: "I am meek and lowly in heart." But where were His meekness and lowliness in making such a claim, if He were simply a man like ourselves?

In the same spirit are those memorable passages in which this wonderful personage speaks of Himself as our peace. "Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth, give I unto you" (John 14:27). "These words have I spoken unto you, that in *Me* ye might have peace" (John 16:33). Thus ever does the Lord concentrate our thoughts upon *Himself*. But what must He be to be worthy of such supreme attention?

9. *Jesus permitted Thomas to adore Him as his Lord and his God, and pronounced an eulogium upon the faith thus displayed.* (John 20:28.) On this fact we quote the admirable comment of Dean Alford: "The Socinian view, that these words, *'my Lord and my God,'* are merely an exclamation, is refuted, (1) By the fact that no such exclamations were in use among the Jews. (2) By the εἶπεν αὐτῷ (he said to *Him,* that is, Christ). (3) By the impossibility of referring ὁ κύριός μου, my Lord, to another than Jesus. (See verse 13.) (4) By the New Testament usage of expressing the vocative by the nominative with an article. (5) By the utter psychological absurdity of such a supposition; that one just convinced of the presence of Him whom he deeply

loved, should, instead of addressing Him, break out into an irrelevant cry. (6) By the further absurdity of supposing that if such were the case, the Apostle John, who, of all the sacred writers, most constantly keeps in mind the object for which he is writing, should have recorded anything so beside that object. (7) By the intimate connection of πεπίστευκας, *thou hast believed.* (See next verse.)

"Dismissing it, therefore, we observe that this is *the highest confession* of faith which has yet been made; and that it shows that (though not yet fully) the meaning of the previous confessions of His being *'the Son of God'* was understood. Thus John, in the very close of his Gospel iterates the testimony with which he began it—to the Godhead of the Word who became flesh, and, by this closing confession, shows how *the testimony of Jesus to Himself* had gradually deepened and exalted the apostles' conviction, from the time when they knew Him only as ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Ἰωσήφ (1:46), 'the son of Joseph,' till now, when He is acknowledged as their Lord and their God." (Alford's Greek New Testament, on the passage.)

These judicious remarks leave nothing to be added as to the real application of the words, "my Lord and my God." But how did the Saviour *receive* this act of adoration? He commended it, and held it up for the imitation of the coming ages. "Jesus saith unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen Me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed" (29). He thus most emphatically declared His Lordship and Godhead. But how fearful was His crime in so doing, if He was only a Socinian Christ!

This conversation produced a deep impression upon the apostolical mind, and upon the early Church. Stephen invoked Jesus in prayer with his dying breath. (Acts 7:59.) Paul thrice besought the Lord (Jesus) in supplication, that this thorn in the flesh might be taken from him, and received an answer from the Lord. (2 Cor. 12:8, compared

with the *next* verse, the 9th.) The prayer was offered to Jesus, and was responded to by Jesus, as the context demonstrates.

The primitive disciples are thus described: "All that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours" (1 Cor. 1:2).

Every convert was, by Christ's orders, baptized in His name conjointly with that of the Father and the Holy Spirit; and thus the whole Church was taught to adore Him as equal with God at the solemn hour of religious profession. (Matt. 28:19.)

The apostolical benediction invokes Jesus in prayer with God and the Holy Ghost (2 Cor. 13:14), and the entire sacred record closes with a solemn litany to the Son: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen" (Rev. 22:21). Again we ask, Who is this if He be not the God-man?

10. *Jesus indirectly compared Himself with God.* He did so in these words: "No man knoweth the Son [Luke gives it, "Who the Son is"], but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father [Luke gives it, "Who the Father is"], save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him" (See Matt. 11:27 and Luke 10:22). These statements are, perhaps, the most remarkable that fell even from the lips of Jesus. In them He asserted the Son to be as great a mystery as the Father, and consequently as difficult to know. This was in effect claiming equality with God. Nothing less can be made of it. Then, too, the Lord professed such a knowledge of God as can only be possessed by God. He indeed asserted that He knew the Father as well as the Father knew Him. Altogether, no language can well be more shockingly familiar and profane than these words of the Saviour were, if He were no more than a man. Let the reader well ponder them in the version both of Matthew and Luke.

On one occasion our Lord declared, "My Father is greater than all" (John 10:29); and on another, "My Father is greater than I" (John 14:28). But if our Lord was *only* a man, what need was there that He should tell us *this*? What should we think of any mere mortal who should stand up in our midst, and deliberately tell us that the Eternal Father is greater than he? Should we not question his sanity? Or should we not look upon the very comparison as a blasphemy? For what can justify a creature in such a virtual likening of himself to God? We are compelled to the conclusion that there must have been some other element in our Lord's nature, besides the human, which warranted Him in making so remarkable a statement. What danger was there that we should fail to recognize the superiority of the Eternal Father to the man Christ Jesus, if the latter was *no more than* a man? These words, generally supposed to be a stronghold of Unitarianism, are, in truth, an indirect testimony to the orthodox faith. For what comparison can there be between the Creator and a mere creature, between Infinity and one who is "less than nothing and vanity"?

11. *Jesus demands of us an unhesitating and unlimited faith in Himself; such faith, in short, as we should only exercise in God.* We are to believe in Him for the salvation of our entire being; not merely as pointing out to us the way to heaven, but as being *Himself* the way. He puts faith in Him in the same category as faith in the Father. (John 14:1.) The spirit of His teaching about the faith to be reposed in Him is given in His words to the woman of Samaria: "If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith unto thee, Give me to drink, thou wouldest have asked of Him, and He would have given thee living water." "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life" (John 4:10-14). Unless we exercise faith in His person and work,

figuratively called eating His flesh and drinking His blood, we have no life in us (John 6:53); but if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever (51). Those who have given themselves up into the arms of Christ by faith receive eternal life from Him, and shall never perish. (John 10:28.) They are as much in the arms of Jesus as in the arms of the Father; and their safety is as much secured by one as by the other (compare 28, 29, 30). In fact, in this gracious transaction the Son and the Father are one (30). Well might the Jews, with their views of His origin, take up stones to stone Him for these claims, saying as they did it, "We stone Thee for blasphemy, because that Thou, being a man, makest Thyself God" (33). Our Lord's vindication of Himself, by a reference to the language of Psalm 82:6, is an illustration of the *argument from the less to the greater.* If in *any* sense the Jewish rulers might be called gods, how much more properly might *He,* the only begotten Son of the Father, be so designated? "Without Me ye can do nothing," is in short the essence of the Saviour's teaching about Himself. (See John 15:1-5.)

This is the sum of the Gospel message: Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and ye shall be saved. It was a demand repeatedly and earnestly pressed by the Saviour, and inculcated by His apostles; and we say deliberately, that to exercise such a faith in Jesus as He required and the Gospel enforces, would, *with Socinian views,* be to expose ourselves to the terrible anathema: "Cursed is the man that trusteth in man, and that maketh flesh in his arm" (Jer. 17:5). How could my soul be safe in the arms of a mere man? How dare I trust my eternal redemption to the care of such a Christ? And on what principle did Paul say: "I can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me" (Phil 4:13). And how can Jesus be "All in all" to true believers of every nation? (Col. 3:11.)

12. *The affection and devotion to His glory, which Jesus demands, are such as can be properly yielded only to God.* As we are to trust Christ for everything, so we are to give up everything for Him, should He demand the sacrifice. This was a doctrine which the Lord repeatedly taught. Let our readers study Matt. 10:37-39, and the parallel passage, Luke 14:26, 27, and they will see at once how uncompromising is the Saviour's demand. Father, mother, son, daughter, wife, and even life itself are all to be sacrificed, if devotion to Christ necessitates the surrender. All creatures, and all things, and our very lives are to be to us as nothing when compared with Christ. God Himself demands no less of us, and no more. What more *could* the Eternal Creator require? The moral law says: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and Him only shalt thou serve." But Christ bids us love *Him* thus, and demands of us the homage and sacrifice of our whole being; now, if He be not the *Author* of our being, what right has He to urge such a demand upon us? I could not love Christ as He requires to be loved, if I did not believe in Him as the Incarnate God. To do so with Socinian views would be idolatry. Yet the motives which reigned in the hearts of inspired apostles are summed up in this one: "The love of Christ constraineth us," and they laid down the law, that all men are henceforth to live "not to themselves, but to Him who died for them and rose again" (2 Cor. 5:14, 15). And Jesus declared that our eternal destiny will take its character from our compliance or non-compliance with His demands: "Whosoever therefore shall confess Me before men, him will I confess also before My Father who is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before My Father who is in heaven" (Matt. 10:32, 33, 38-42, cf. Matt. 25: 45, 46), and the sentiment is echoed in apostolical teaching, the language of which is, "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha" (1 Cor. 16:22). But clearly

the suspension of such tremendous issues on the decree of our love for the person of a mere creature, is an idea utterly revolting to our moral sense. He must be the God-man.

13. *Jesus set Himself forth as the appropriate end of our lives and of all divine providences.* He requires us to live for Him, and for His glory. As we have seen, life is to be sacrificed, if fidelity to Him shall so require. The sickness of Lazarus, He taught, was ordered, "that the Son of God might be glorified thereby" (John 11:4). He expounded the scope of the Holy Spirit's mission in one pregnant sentence: *"He shall glorify Me"* (John 16:14; John 15:26).

This Messianic reading of all things proved wonderfully suggestive. It is amplified in the apostolical Epistles. Thus, Christ is "Lord both of the dead and the living" (Rom. 14:9). The great object of apostolic desire was, that Christ might be magnified in their bodies, whether by life or by death. (Phil. 1:20.) The early Church's one idea of the present state was: "For to me to live is Christ" (Phil. 1:21). And they looked forward to the final Epiphany, because Christ would then "come to be glorified in His saints, and to be admired in all them that believe," and because His name will then be "glorified in you" (2 Thess. 1:10-12).

Under Him, as the Universal Head, all things are finally to be gathered, and towards this consummation all things are now working. (See Eph. 1:10.)

Now, such a presentation of Christ by Christ, and by His apostles inspired by Himself and His Spirit, we cannot harmonize with Socinian views. For surely He, *for whose glory* we are to live, and the whole universe exists, must be the Lord of all, God over all, blessed for evermore. What right has our Lord to be the supreme End of life, if He be not its Source, its Preserver, in short, its God?

14. *Very suggestive, too, are those passages in which Jesus promised His continued presence to His disciples after His ascension.* Beautiful are the words: "Where two or three

are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them" (Matt. 18:20). One of the last promises of our Lord was, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world" (Matt. 28:20). No perverse criticism can explain away these assurances; they guarantee the perpetual, personal presence of Jesus with all His disciples to the end of time.

And this idea had a wonderful influence over the thoughts and actions of the men whom Jesus inspired. They lived as those who were perpetually under their Lord's eye. Thus one speaks in the name of all: "Wherefore we labor, that, whether present or absent [from Christ as to his bodily presence, see 6 and 8], we may be accepted of Him [Christ]" (2 Cor. 5:9). Though denied His bodily presence, His divine they knew to be ever with them; hence they labored to please Him, and the best wish they could breathe for each other was, "The Lord Jesus Christ be with thy spirit" (2 Tim. 4:22).

And John saw Him in vision ever holding the ministerial stars in His right hand, and walking in the midst of the golden lamps—the churches. (Rev. 2:1.)

But how can we explain such representations as these, if Messiah be possessed of but one nature—the human, which must of necessity be local and limited as to its presence? Who is this that is always with His disciples in all countries at the same moment, but the Infinite One in a human form? We feel His presence; we know He is with us; and in this fact we have evidence that He is more than a man.

The line of argument we have been pursuing is by no means exhausted, but our space is filled. Every time we read the New Testament through, we detect new illustrations of the force of the testimony illustrated in this paper. Let the reader re-peruse for himself the sacred record with an eye to the hints which we have thrown out. Let him weigh again the old familiar phrases in which the Lord speaks, or is spoken of, and ask himself how he can explain them on any other

principle than the orthodox view of our Lord's person and work, and he will be astonished to find how this view is woven into the very texture of the whole Gospel. Jesus Christ was neither the Holy One, nor the Just One, if He were not the God-man. (See Acts 3:14; Acts 2:27; Acts 7:52.) In short, we must tear up our Bibles and wait for a new Christ, if He of Nazareth be not what all His teachings compel us to believe He was, God Incarnate.

A Socinian may well ask: "Whence hath this man this wisdom, and these mighty works?" (Matt. 13:54); but to us that question is forever answered by the assurance that "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us (and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth" (John 1:14).

The argument is *cumulative,* and must be looked at as a whole as well as in detail. To us it appears irresistible.

Let no Unitarian seek to evade its force by taking refuge in those passages which affirm Christ's inferiority, as man and mediator, to His Father; such as Mark 13:32; John 10:29, and John 14:28. Such passages as these are not to the purpose. No one denies that, as man and mediator, our Lord was inferior to His Father. But to prove that He was inferior in one sense, does not disprove that He was equal in another sense. When you have demonstrated that He was a man, you have not shaken, or even touched, the evidence that He was God. The Saviour had a human soul with its natural limitation of knowledge, and a human body with exposure to death. This is admitted on all sides. The orthodox believe it as truly as their Unitarian friends. But the Gospel testimony teaches us something more. It reveals the Godhood of Jesus of Nazareth, and tells us that He thought it no robbery to claim equality with His Father. It is, therefore, disingenuous, or, at least, illogical, to quote testimonies to the humanity of the Christ in reply to the proof of His possession of a divine nature as well. The two questions are quite distinct. It is a

non sequitur to affirm that Jesus is not God because He was a man. The point to be demonstrated is *that He was not both.*

There are two classes of Scriptures relating to our Lord: the first, affirming His possession of a human nature, with all its innocent frailties and limitations; the second, ascribing to Him a divine nature, possessed of the attributes of Godhood, performing divine works, and worthy of supreme honor and worship. Unitarians can only fairly explain one of these classes of Scriptures, the former; but Trinitarians can accept both classes, and expound them in their integrity and fullness. We are not stumbled by evidences that Jesus was "bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh." We rejoice in Him as in one "touched with a feeling of our infirmities;" but we have no need to refine away, by a subtle and unfair criticism, the ascription to His person of divine perfections and works.

We gladly recognize the learning and the talents of many of the prominent Unitarian divines. We know that by the side of some of them we are but babes in intellect and attainment. But we remember that there was a time when "Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes" (Matt. 11:25).

The times demand of us a vigorous re-assertion of the old truths, which are the very foundations of the Gospel system. *Humanity needs a Christ whom all can worship and adore.* The mythical account of Strauss' "Leben Jesu"; the unreal and romantic Christ of Renan's "Vie de Jesus"; and even the merely human Christ of "Ecce Homo," can never work any deliverance in the earth. Such a Messiah does not meet the yearnings of fallen human nature. It does not answer the pressing query, "How shall man be just with God?" It supplies no effective or sufficient agency for the regeneration of man's moral powers. It does not bring God down to us in our nature. Such a Christ we may criticise and admire, as we would Socrates, or Plato, or Milton, or Shakespeare; but

we cannot trust Him with our salvation; we cannot love Him with all our hearts; we cannot pour forth at His feet the homage of our whole being; for to do so would be idolatry.

A so-called Saviour, whose only power to save lies in the excellent moral precepts that He gave, and the pure life that He lived; who is no longer the God-man, but the mere man; whose blood had no sacrificial atoning or propitiatory power in the moral government of Jehovah, but was simply a martyr's witness to a superior system of ethics—is not the Saviour of the four Gospels, or of Paul, or Peter, or John. It is not under the banners of such a Messiah that the Church of God has achieved its triumphs. The Christ of the New Testament, of the early Church, of universal Christendom; the Christ, the power of whose name has revolutionized the world and raised it to its present level, and under whose guidance the sacramental host of God's redeemed are advancing and shall advance to yet greater victories over superstition and sin, is Immanuel, God with us, in our nature, whose blood "cleanseth us from all sin," and who is "able to save, even to the uttermost, all that come unto God through Him."

CHAPTER XIII

THE PERSON AND WORK OF JESUS CHRIST

FROM "SOME RECENT PHASES OF GERMAN THEOLOGY,"*

BY BISHOP JOHN L. NUELSEN, D. D., M. E. CHURCH,
OMAHA, NEB.

Every Old Testament problem becomes in course of time a New Testament question. Every Biblical question places us after a while face to face with Him who is the center of the whole Bible, with Jesus Christ. In the present discussion over the person and Gospel of Jesus Christ, I shall confine myself to pointing out briefly some of the most interesting and important features of this subject.

WAS JESUS A REAL, HISTORICAL PERSON?

In the closing years of the eighteenth century the thought was advanced by a number of rationalistic theologians that the doctrines held by the Church and formulated in her creeds were the joint product of New Testament religion and Greek philosophy. This thought was taken up by Professor Harnack of Berlin, and in his great work, "History of the Christian Doctrine," he disclosed the complicated process by which the Church in developing her doctrines became Hellenized; thus it was made incumbent upon the student of Church history to extricate, by a process of careful analysis and comparison, the genuinely Christian elements from the meshes of foreign thought. Harnack, it is true, applied this principle only to post-apostolic times, but since the appearance of his book investigation has proceeded along the same lines and is now covering the Biblical writings as well.

*Copyright by Jennings & Graham, and published by permission.

Old Testament scholars and Semitists—as Gunkel, Meyer, Meinhold, Gressmann, Winckler, Simmern, Jensen—followed the traces of Babylonian influences down through the period of later Judaism to New Testament times; New Testament scholars—as Schurer, Baldensperger, Bousset, Pfleiderer, Schmiedel, Holtzman, Weinel, Wernle, Wrede—studied Greek and Jewish thought in its influence upon the early Christian writings. They deemed it necessary to eliminate first the whole of Johannine theology as a foreign substance; then they threw overboard the Apostle Paul as the great perverter of the simple teachings of Christ; next they cleared the Synoptical Gospels of all Babylonian, Egyptian, Phrygian, Jewish, Greek and other foreign matter. They have just about finished this arduous work of purifying and simplifying the Gospels by this double process of "religionsgeschichtliche" analysis and comparison, in order to discover the real, historical Christ; they meet at the feet of this Christ, to see Him as He really is; but behold, He is no more! Not a trace of Him is left. Trait after trait, feature after feature, has been analyzed and compared, until neither manger nor cross nor grave, not even His garments, are left. A few years ago we had, by the grace of the most advanced scholarship, at least a plain Galilean peasant with a very good heart. Even if His mind was rather too simple, we were allowed to believe in a kind-hearted carpenter's son, who went about doing good, and to whom at least eight rather inoffensive sayings could be historically traced; as, for example, the saying, "It is more blessed to give than to receive;" but even this peasant has evaporated, or rather, the great Babylonian flood which the mighty Bel caused to drown all mankind has completely swallowed up the little that was left of Jesus of Nazareth.

I beg pardon for this tone of levity. The whole matter would be very serious if it were not so utterly absurd. But the fact is that German theology is just now confronted with

the question, was Jesus Christ a real, historical person, or is He nothing but a literary hero?

From two very different quarters the question as to the historicity of Jesus of Nazareth has been raised. At first blush we may think it is ridiculous to raise the question at all. And so it is. But the very fact that scholars do raise the question and mean to be taken seriously, is the necessary result of tendencies in theology which have been fostered until they have reached this culmination point. This fact will, I trust, open the eyes of many in Germany, and in America as well, who are in the habit of intrusting themselves to the guidance of brilliant and charming leaders without realizing at the start whither they were going.

WAS CHRIST A PRODUCT OF BABYLONIAN MYTHOLOGY?

The first avenue which led to the negation of the historicity of Jesus Christ is the "religionsgeschichtliche" comparison. The religionsgeschichtliche study of the New Testament aims, as Professor Bousett puts it, "to understand the origin and development of Christianity by means of an investigation of the whole environment of primitive Christianity." Applying this principle to the person and work of Christ, Professor Pfleiderer of Berlin, in his "Early Conceptions of Christ," finds that the Christ of the Church has been formed out of those myths and legends which are the common property of religion all over the world.

The elements of the figure are roughly separable into five groups. There is Christ, the Son of God; Christ the Conqueror; Christ the Wonder-worker; Christ the Conqueror of death and the Lifegiver; Christ the King of kings and Lord of lords. The materials for each of these conceptions were taken from various sources. They came from Judaism, from Hellenism, from Mithraism, and the Graeco-Egyptian religion, from Zoroastrianism, and even from Buddhism. They came gradually, and gradually the conception took shape.

The specific contribution of Babylonian mythology to the picture of Christ, as depicted in the Gospels, consists, according to Professor Zimmern, of the following points: (1) "The conception of Christ as a pre-mundane, heavenly, Divine being, who is at the same time the Creator of the world; (2) The accounts of the miraculous birth of Christ, of the homage offered to the new-born child, and of the persecutions; (3) The conception of Christ as the Saviour of the world, and as ushering in a new period of time, appearing as He does in the fullness of time; (4) The conception of Christ as being sent into the world by the Father; (5) The doctrinal aspects of the suffering and death of Christ, apart from the historic facts; (6) The doctrine of the descent of Christ into Hades; (7) The doctrine of the resurrection of Christ on the third day after His death; (8) The doctrine of His ascension after forty days; (9) The doctrine of Christ's glory, sitting at the right hand of God and reigning with the Father; (10) The belief in the coming again of Christ at the end of days in kingly glory, and also of the last conflict with the powers of evil; (11) The idea of the marriage of Christ with His Bride at the beginning of the new time, of the new heaven, and the new earth."

While Professor Zimmern advances these thoughts very carefully and guardedly, Professor Jensen, of the University of Marburg, affirms most positively that the whole life of Christ is essentially a Jewish version of the Babylonian Gilgamesh Epos. His book appeared February, 1907, is a large volume of over one thousand pages, and bears the title, "The Epos of Gilgamesh in the World Literature. The Origins of the Old Testament Patriarch, Prophet, and Redeemer Legends, and of the New Testament Jesus Legend."

The main contention of the book is stated by the author himself in the following words: "That practically all of the Gospel narrative is purely legendary, and that there is no reason at all to consider anything that is told of Jesus as

historical. The Jesus legend is an Israelitish Gilgamesh legend. —As a Gilgamesh legend the Jesus legend is a sister legend to numerous, particularly to most of the Old Testament, legends." In his concluding chapter Professor Jensen writes: "Jesus of Nazareth, in whom, as in the Son of God and the Saviour of the world, Christianity has believed for nearly two thousands years, and who is regarded, even by the most advanced scholarship of our own day, as a good and great man who lived and died the sublime pattern of the ideal ethical life—this Jesus has never lived upon earth; neither has He died, because He is nothing but an Israelitish Gilgamesh. We, the children of a much lauded time of progress and achievements, we who look down upon the superstitions of the past with a forbearing smile, we worship in our cathedrals and churches, in our meetinghouses and schools, in palaces and shanties, a Babylonian deity." There was a time when critical analysis of the Biblical texts ran wild. Professor Jensen's book is comparison run mad.

I should not have taken the time to quote from Jensen, but should have dismissed his book wth a forbearing smile, if he were not taken seriously by a number of scholars. To my amazement I noticed that as careful and sane a scholar as Professor Zimmern wrote an extended review of the book, approving it almost without qualification, and saying: "Jensen will hardly succeed at once in seeing his ideas accepted. But truth is not depending upon immediate success, and will in this case, even as in others, be victorious, though not without great trouble, and only slowly. The weight of facts which this book adduces is too immense."

The other reason why I referred to this book is to show that the logical and unavoidable result of explaining everything distinctively Christian in the Bible by applying the principle of comparison, or, in other words, that the strict and unhampered following of the "religionsgeschichtliche" method, as it is in vogue at present, must lead to absurdities.

THE MYTH OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT

Allow me a digression. I wish to apply these same principles of analysis and comparison to a modern personality, following strictly the methods of Professor Jensen. Suppose Lord Macaulay's famous New Zealander, whom he pictures as standing upon a broken arch of London Bridge, in the midst of a vast solitude, to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's should come over to America and dig in the sand-hills covering the Congressional Library in Washington. He finds a great pile of literature which originated in the first few years of the twentieth century. In the very learned book which our New Zealand scholar publishes he refers to the fact that at the beginning of the twentieth century the head of the great American nation was supposed to be a strong and influential man by the name of Theodore Roosevelt. His name has gone down in history, but our scholar proves that Theodore Roosevelt was no historical person at all. He never lived; he is merely the personification of tendencies and mythological traits then dominant in the American nation.

For instance, this legendary hero is commonly pictured with a big stick. Now, this is plainly a mythological trait, borrowed from the Greeks and Romans, and represents really the thunderbolt of Jupiter. He is pictured as wearing a broad brimmed hat and large eye-glasses. This mythological feature is borrowed from old Norse mythology, and represents Woden endeavoring to pierce through the heavy clouds of fog covering his head. A great many pictures show the legendary hero smiling and displaying his teeth. This is a very interesting feature, showing the strong African influences in American civilization. Many contradictory legends are told about this man. He was a great hunter; he was a rough rider; but he was also a scholar and author of a number of learned books. He lived in the mountains, on the prairie, and in a large city. He was a leader in war, but also a peacemaker. It is said that he was appealed to by antagonizing

factions, even by warring nations, to arbitrate. It is self-evident that we have here simply the personification of prominent character traits of the American people at various stages of their historical development. They loved to hunt, to ride, to war; reaching a higher stage of civilization, they turned to studying, writing books, making peace; and all these contradictory traits were, in course of time, used to draw the picture of this legendary national hero. Some mythological features have not yet been fully cleared up; for instance, that he is often represented in the shape of a bear or accompanied by bears. For a while these "Teddy Bears" were in nearly every house, and it seems as if they even were worshipped, at least by the children. There is no doubt that some remote astral conception lies at the root of this rather puzzling feature.

But two reasons are conclusive to establish the legendary thesis: (1) The American nation, at the beginning of the twentieth century, had hardly emerged from the crudity of fetichism and witchcraft. Many traces of fortune-telling, charms, sorcery, and other forms of superstition can be found by studying the daily papers. Even this hero Roosevelt was given to some such superstition. Whenever he desired to bring any one under his spell and charm him, he took him by the hand and pronounced a certain magical word. As far as I can discover it spells something like "dee-lighted." (2) The other conclusive proof is the name. Theodore is taken from the language of a people representing the southern part of Europe and means "Gift of God;" Roosevelt is taken from the language of a people representing the northern part of Europe, and means "Field of Roses." The idea is evident. This hero personifies the union of the two European races which laid the foundations of early American civilization—the Romanic and the Teutonic races; and the Americans imagined that a man who united in himself all those wonderful traits of character must necessarily be a

miraculous "Gift of God," and furthermore they thought that if a man personifying their ideals really had full sway, their country would be changed to a "Field of Roses."

This explanation is strictly scientific. No doubt a good many machine politicians and heads of trusts would be delighted to awake some morning and find out that Theodore Roosevelt is nothing but a mythological figure. But, he is not. He is a living fact and tremendous power in the life of our nation. And so is Jesus Christ.

THE CHRIST OF LIBERAL THEOLOGY

The other avenue which led to the negation of the historicity of Jesus Christ is the well-known modernization and reduction of the life and work of Jesus which liberal theologians have accomplished by means of literary and historical criticism. The history of the critical investigation of the life of Jesus during the last hundred and fifty years is an intensely interesting and instructive study. It has recently been summarized by Dr. A. Schweitzer in his book, "From Reimarus to Wrede." (Reimarus, the contemporary of Lessing, whose "Wolfenbuttler Fragmente" mark the beginning of modern critical research in the life of Christ; Professor William Wrede, who died in November, 1906, was one of the most prominent liberal theologians.) A more popular presentation of the subject, covering the latest phases, is given by Professor Grutzmacher in his booklet, "Is the Liberal Picture of Jesus Modern?"

Without going into the history of this investigation, I merely state that the life of Christ as it is presented now by all liberal theologians—like Harnack, Bousset, Weinel, Wrede, Holtzmann, Julicher, Wernle—as the established result of critical scientific research, is gained, not from an examination of the whole New Testament material, but by means of a complicated process of finding the alleged true sources from which this life may be construed. The oldest por-

tions of the New Testament literature, the Pauline writings, are not to be considered as genuine sources, because, as Professor Wernle states, "Jesus knew nothing of that which to St. Paul is everything. That Jesus regarded Himself as an object of worship must be doubted; that He ascribed any meritorious atonement to His death is altogether improbable. Paul is not a disciple of Jesus. He is a new phenomenon. Paul is much further removed from Jesus in his teaching than he would seem to be when regarded only chronologically."

We turn now to the four Gospels, but of these "the Gospel of John can in no wise be considered a historical source," says Harnack; and he is seconded in this assertion by all liberals. Says Wernle: "St. John must retire in favor of the Synoptic Gospels as source of the life of Christ. Jesus was as the Synoptics represent Him, not as St. John depicts Him." And again: "In the first Gospels there is nothing taught concerning redemption, atonement, regeneration, reception of the Holy Spirit. An altogether different picture is presented by the greater part of the other New Testament writings, especially by the writings of Paul and John."

But even the Synoptic Gospels have to be critically analyzed in order to find the true portrait of Christ. The Gospels of Matthew and Luke, especially in their accounts of the infancy and of the death of Jesus and of the events that took place after His death, and in many other instances as well, are rather a portraiture of the crude beliefs of the early Christian churches than a historically trustworthy account of the real facts. Even in the Gospel of Mark, which is considered the oldest and purest, we find, according to Professor Wernle, that "the historic portrait of Jesus is quite obscured; His person is placed in a grotesquely fantastic light."

Thus analytical criticism is compelled to search for the sources of the Gospels, and it claims to have found princi-

pally two of them; namely, the older Mark document, the source of the present Gospel of St. Mark, and the Logia, or collection of sayings of Jesus, the supposed source of the Gospel of St. Matthew. It is probably true that our present Gospels are based upon previous sources; but, in the absence of fixed data, it is impossible to determine with any degree of certainty just what those sources contained. But critical acumen cannot rest satisfied even with those sources. Says Wernle: "They are not free from the possibility of modification and adulteration. They represent the belief of the Christians as it developed in the course of four decades." It is therefore needful to distinguish between genuine elements and later additions in those sources. This is an exceedingly difficult and delicate task, especially since we do not know, for a certainty, the form nor the substance of those sources. How is it accomplished? We have noted an "inner consciousness" of many textual critics. I am reminded of this when I hear Harnack blandly say: "Whoever has a good eye for the vital and a true sense of the really great must be able to see it, and distinguish between the kernel and the transitory husk;" or when I hear Professor Pfleiderer speak of "healthy eyes;" or see how Bousset finds the proofs of genuineness in the fact that "it is psychologically comprehensible," or Mehlhorn in the fact that "it could not have been invented." It is with a sense of relief that we read Professor Bousset's refreshingly naive concession that where we find the sources too meager "we may occasionally make use of our imagination."

Unfortunately our imagination is not a safer guide in historical and scientific matters than is our inner consciousness, and the eyesight of no two men is exactly alike. A few years ago there was in Berlin an exhibition of paintings representing scenes from the life of Christ. Hundreds of paintings were exhibited; they were very interesting to look at, but they did not contribute anything to our knowledge of the real ap-

pearance of Jesus Christ. They were nothing but the portraitures of the conceptions which the various artists entertained as to the features of Christ. Each artist portrayed his own ideal of Jesus. Some of the portraits looked so strange that no one would have thought it a picture of Jesus Christ if it had not been labeled as such.

This is precisely the case with all these modern attempts to write a life of Jesus Christ minus St. Paul, minus St. John, minus Matthew, Luke and Mark. If you examine the character of this Jesus closely, you will find that He is really a portraiture of what the author considers his ideal of a pure and holy life, clothed in the garb of an Oriental peasant two thousands years ago.

We cannot here reproduce the details of this twentieth-century ideal in its strange and ancient environments; it is a picture of a man from whom every supernatural, miraculous, mysterious trait has been erased. "Jesus has nowhere overstepped the limits of the purely human," says Bousset; and again: We do no longer start with the thought that Jesus was absolutely different from us; that He was from above, we from below. And consequently we do no longer speak of the divinity of Christ."

Doubts and fears, joys and griefs, moments of ecstasy and of utter dejection, all the changing moods of a poor human heart, may be found in His life. "He was a poor, disquieted man, at times shouting with joy, at times woefully despondent," writes Gustave Frenssen, and adds: "Sometimes He was treading upon the very borderland of exalted insanity."

On the whole, Jesus was the personification of faith in God, brotherly love, and faith in immortality; at times He seems to have taken Himself as the Messiah of His people; in everything He was subject to the limitations of mankind. There is only one difference between this modern view and the old rationalistic view. While the old rationalists, by all sorts of exegetical jugglery, vainly attempted to show that

their human and purely naturalistic view of Jesus was really contained in the New Testament records, the modern rationalists are outspoken in their assertion that their own view is radically different from that of the New Testament writers. They do not in the least try to bridge over this chasm, but state emphatically as Julicher does: "Where even the first apostles have totally misunderstood Jesus we must try to understand Him better."

This is the picture of Christ which the leading liberal theologians of today have scattered broadcast in tens of thousands of copies of cheap pamphlets, which is described Sunday after Sunday in thousands of pulpits both in Germany, and, somewhat modified and as yet retouched, also in America. But again a reaction has set in, the sweep of which can not as yet be wholly comprehended.

THE VERDICT OF INFIDELITY

A pupil of modern liberal theologians, the former pastor Gustav Frenssen, who is a novel-writer of great force, wrote a novel, "Hilligenlei" (Holy Land), of which hundreds of thousands of copies were sold. The hero of this novel, Kai Jans, is, as is generally admitted, a true reproduction of the picture of Christ as painted by the liberal theologians. This book, as well as some other recent publications, gave rise to a number of reviews of the "modern Christ" by eminent literary men and by philosophers who do not claim to be Christians, but are known and desire to be known as leaders of free thought. Some of them were formerly theologians, but have lost their faith in the fundamental truths of Christianity. Of these writers I mention Adolf Bartels, editor of the "Kunstwart," Leo Berg, Eduard von Hartmann, A. Drews, W. Von Schnehen, C. A. Bernoulli, Dr. Kalthoff, the President of the League of Monists, and also two physicians, Doctors De Loosten and E. Rasmussen.

What do these men say? The two physicians claim that the only rational explanation of this Christ is to consider Him as one of the great pathological figures in the world's history; that means, in other words, that He was partially insane. The others say exactly what conservative theologians—as B. Weiss, Ihmels, Kahler, Zahm, Haussleiter, Grutzmacher, Lemme, and others—always have said against this naturalistic representation of Jesus, and what was ignored by liberal theologians. But here are men who were trained in the methods of Pfleiderer, Bousset, and their kin; men who possess as much critical acumen and philosophic penetration as do the liberal leaders; men whose thinking is in no wise fettered by dogmatic prejudices,—and their almost unanimous verdict is really remarkable.

All of them say that this picture of Christ is both unscientific and unhistorical. It is unscientific, because the methods applied are purely subjective. Says Dr. Kalthoff, after analyzing the Jesus of a number of modern theologians: "Every scholar leaves of the words of Christ only what he can make use of according to his preconceived notions of what is historically possible. Lacking every historical definiteness, the name of Jesus has become an empty vessel into which every theologian pours his own thoughts and ideas."

Eduard von Hartmann shows that the only results which this method of analytical criticism has arrived at are negative results. "The historic Christ remains a problematical figure which is of no religious value at all." W. von Schnehen quotes the liberal Professor Steck, who says: "A strict application of these principles of research will show that there is not one solitary word of Jesus of which we know for certain that it was spoken thus and not otherwise by Jesus," and uses this assertion to prove that all pictures of Christ are admittedly uncertain, and consequently unscientific.

But another argument which is of much greater import is advanced. Kalthoff, von Schnehen, and von Hartmann

reason thus: If the liberal theologians admit that their picture of Christ is different from that which was believed by the Church during all the centuries of her existence—different from that of St. Paul, of St. John, of the Synoptic Gospels, of the sources of the Synoptic Gospels; if, as Professor Pfleiderer says, "Jewish phophecy, rabbinical teachings, Oriental gnosis, and Greek philosophy had already put the colors on the palette from which the picture of Christ was painted in the New Testament writings;" if, as is admitted, the Church was built from the very beginning, not upon the Galilean peasant Jesus, but upon the Christ, the Son of God; and if this Christ is nothing but the creation of speculative theologians, as Paul and John—then there is no need at all of a historic Christ. It is not necessary at all that a man Jesus of Nazareth should ever have lived in order to explain the fact of Christianity.

Even from the point of view of present religious needs of human nature this Jesus of liberal theology is unnecessary. Orthodox theology is Christ-centric; liberal theology is God-centric. "Back to Christ," exclaims Professor Wernle, "but only as a means to return to God the Father. God the Father is to regain that supremacy over our lives which Jesus had intended to give Him, but of which theological dogma has deprived Him." The modern thinkers mentioned above can not see the need of any human mediator between God and man. They want a living, present God, and a constant present communion with Him, if they want a God at all. Neither a Catholic saint nor a dead Jew is to stand between their own lives and God. Says Professor Drews: "The belief in the personal grandeur and the beauty of character of the man Jesus has nothing to do with religion." W. von Schnehen writes still more explicitly: "Even if God should have revealed Himself in the personality of the man Jesus of Nazareth, it is utterly useless to me, unless God reveals Himself to me likewise. If He does reveal Himself to me, then His

revelation to Jesus is of no more import to me than is His revelation to any good man or His revelation in nature. The exemplary moral and religious perfection of Jesus is of no benefit whatever to any one except he has in his being the same moral and religious forces which were in Jesus. But if these powers are inherent in him and can be developed in his life, then it makes no difference by whom they become energized, by Jesus or by some one else."

Quite pathetic are the words of Professor Drews, showing, as they do, the restlessness of an honest but irreligious mind and the dissatisfaction with substitutes in religion: "We are consumed by a burning desire for salvation and we should be satisfied with this fabric of the theologians, this picture of the historic Christ, who changes His features under the hands of every professor of theology who works at it. We need the presence of God, and not His past." And Dr. Kalthoff writes quite correctly: "A God in whom we must believe because scholars say that two thousand years ago the son of a Jewish carpenter believed in Him, is not worth the printer's ink that is being squandered about Him."

THE CHRIST OF THE NEW TESTAMENT THE ONLY CHRIST

I will come to a close. Why have I asked you to read all these quotations? For two reasons: In the first place, I desired to show that the modern method of subjective analysis of the sources and of the "religionsgeschichtliche" comparison leads, and as a matter of fact did lead, to a complete negation of the historicity of the person of Christ. In the second place, I wished to point out that the modern, liberal conception of Christ, which strips Him of all distinctively divine elements and makes a pure man of Him, be He ever so good and holy, be He ever so sublime a pattern of a perfect life, be He ever so trustworthy a guide to God, does not and can not satisfy the modern man. He repudiates this man-made Jesus, and even accuses his makers of lack of scientific spirit and of

dishonesty. Says von Schnehen: "Christianity is not belief in the man Jesus, but faith in Christ the Saviour and Son of God. Not the man Jesus, the lovable preacher and teacher of morals, who did not shrink back from death in obedience to what was His conviction, has conquered the world, but Christ the Son of God, who died upon the cross in order to redeem a lost world. This is the Christ of the Gospels and of the Church. It is dishonest to call this modern view of Jesus and of His religion Christian or evangelical."

It has ever been the mistake of rationalism to try to make Christianity acceptable to the average man by taking off the edges of its supranaturalism. It has ever been a failure, and ever will be so. The testimonies of these modern men show that the portrait of Christ painted by liberal theologians of our own day is an utter failure. They prove that the modern man, as well as man centuries ago, needs and wants exactly the Christ of the Church and the Gospels or no Christ at all.

The only true, historically and scientifically true, picture of the life and work and Gospel of Christ is the one which is given in the New Testament as a whole. The modern historians and philosophers tell the modern liberal theologians in very plain language to be honest and quit calling themselves preachers of the Gospel of Christ if they do not believe in the Christ of the Gospels, and quit calling their congregations churches of Christ if they do not believe in the Christ of the Church. Modern man is opposed to all shams and insincerities. He has no patience with men who, while using the old phraseology, cleverly substitute their self-made Jesus for the God-given Christ. The Christ can not be changed. He is the same yesterday, today and forevermore.

CHAPTER XIV

THE CERTAINTY AND IMPORTANCE OF THE BODILY RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST FROM THE DEAD

BY REV. R. A. TORREY, D. D.

(Copyrighted by R. A. Torrey in Great Britain and America and published herewith by permission.)

The resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead is the corner-stone of Christian doctrine. It is mentioned directly one hundred and four or more times in the New Testament. It was the most prominent and cardinal point in the apostolic testimony. When the apostolic company, after the apostasy of Judas Iscariot, felt it necessary to complete their number again by the addition of one to take the place of Judas Iscariot, it was in order that he might "be a witness with us of His resurrection" (Acts 1:21, 22). The resurrection of Jesus Christ was the one point that Peter emphasized in his great sermon on the Day of Pentecost. His whole sermon centered in that fact. Its key-note was, "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses" (Acts 2:32, cf. vs. 24-31). When the Apostles were filled again with the Holy Spirit some days later, the one central result was that "with great power gave the Apostles *witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus.*" The central doctrine that the Apostle Paul preached to the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers on Mars Hill was Jesus *and the resurrection.* (Acts 17:18, cf. Acts 23:6; 1 Cor. 15:15.) The resurrection of Jesus Christ is one of the two fundamental truths of the Gospel, the other being His atoning death. Paul says in 1 Cor. 15:1, 3, 4, "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the Gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; For I

delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; And that He was buried, and *that He rose again* the third day according to the Scriptures." This was the glad tidings, first, that Christ died for our sins and made atonement; and second, that He rose again. The crucifixion loses its meaning without the resurrection. Without the resurrection, the death of Christ was only the heroic death of a noble martyr. With the resurrection, it is the atoning death of the Son of God. It shows that death to be of sufficient value to cover all our sins, for it was the sacrifice of the Son of God. In it we have an all-sufficient ground for knowing that the blackest sin is atoned for. Disprove the resurrection of Jesus Christ and Christian faith is vain. "If Christ be not risen," cries Paul, "then is our preaching vain and your faith is also vain" (1 Cor. 15:14). And later he adds, "If Christ be not risen, your faith is vain. You are yet in your sins." Paul, as the context clearly shows, is talking about the bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ. The doctrine of the resurrection of Jesus Christ is the one doctrine that has power to save any one who believes it with the heart. As we read in Rom. 10:9, "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that *God hath raised Him from the dead,* thou shalt be saved." To know the power of Christ's resurrection is one of the highest ambitions of the intelligent believer, to attain which he sacrifices all things and counts them but refuse (Phil. 3:8-10 R. V.).

While the literal bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ is the corner-stone of Christian doctrine, it is also the Gibraltar of Christian evidence, and the Waterloo of infidelity and rationalism. If the Scriptural assertions of Christ's resurrection can be established as historic certainties, the claims and doctrines of Christianity rest upon an impregnable foundation. On the other hand, if the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead cannot be established, Christianity must go. It was a true

instinct that led a leading and brilliant agnostic in England to say, that there is no use wasting time discussing the other miracles. The essential question is, Did Jesus Christ rise from the dead? adding, that if He did, it was easy enough to believe the other miracles; but, if not, the other miracles must go.

Are the statements contained in the four Gospels regarding the resurrection of Jesus Christ statements of fact or are they fiction, fables, myths? There are three separate lines of proof that the statements contained in the four Gospels regarding the resurrection of Jesus Christ are exact statements of historic fact.

I. THE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE OF THE AUTHENTICITY AND TRUTHFULNESS OF THE GOSPEL NARRATIVES

This is an altogether satisfactory argument. The external proofs of the authenticity and truthfulness of the Gospel narratives are overwhelming, but the argument is long and intricate and it would take a volume to discuss it satisfactorily. The other arguments are so completely sufficient and overwhelming and convincing to a candid mind that we can do without this, good as it is in its place.

The next argument is from—

II. THE INTERNAL PROOFS OF THE TRUTHFULNESS OF THE GOSPEL RECORDS

This argument is thoroughly conclusive, and we shall state it briefly in the pages which follow. We shall not assume anything whatever. We shall not assume that the four Gospel records are true history; we shall not assume that the four Gospels were written by the men whose names they bear, though it could be easily proven that they were; we shall not even assume that they were written in the century in which Jesus is alleged to have lived and died and risen again, nor in the next century, nor in the next. We will assume absolutely nothing. We will start out with a fact which we all know

to be a fact, namely, that we have the four Gospels today, whoever wrote them and whenever they were written. We shall place these four Gospels side by side, and see if we can discern in them the marks of truth or of fiction.

1. The first thing that strikes us as we compare these Gospels one with another is that they are *four separate and independent accounts.* This appears plainly from the apparent discrepancies in the four different accounts. These apparent discrepancies are marked and many. It would have been impossible for these four accounts to have been made up in collusion with one another, or to have been derived from one another and so many and so marked discrepancies to be found in them. There is harmony between the four accounts, but the harmony does not lie upon the surface; it comes out only by protracted and thorough study. It is precisely such a harmony as would exist between accounts written or related by several different persons, each looking at the events recorded from his own standpoint. It is precisely such a harmony as would not exist in four accounts manufactured in collusion, or derived one from the other. In four accounts manufactured in collusion, whatever of harmony there might be would appear on the surface. Whatever discrepancy there might be would only come out by minute and careful study. But with the four Gospels the case is just the opposite. Harmony comes out by minute and careful study, and the apparent discrepancy lies upon the surface. Whether true or false, these four accounts are separate and independent from one another. (The four accounts also supplement one another, the third account sometimes reconciling apparent discrepancies between two.)

These accounts must be either a record of facts that actually occurred or else fictions. If fictions, they must have been fabricated in one of two ways—either independently of one another, or in collusion with one another. They cannot have been fabricated independently of one another; the agreements

are too marked and too many. It is absolutely incredible that four persons sitting down to write an account of what never occurred independently of one another should have made their stories agree to the extent that these do. On the other hand, they cannot have been made up, as we have already seen, in collusion with one another; the apparent discrepancies are too numerous and too noticeable. It is proven they were not made up independently of one another; it is proven they were not made up in collusion with one another, so we are driven to the conclusion that they were not made up at all, that they are a true relation of facts as they actually occurred. We might rest the argument here and reasonably call the case settled, but we will go on still further:

2. The next thing we notice is that *each of these accounts bears striking indications of having been derived from eye witnesses*

The account of an eye witness is readily distinguishable from the account of one who is merely retailing what others have told him. Any one who is accustomed to weigh evidence in court or in historical study soon learns how to distinguish the report of an eye witness from mere heresay evidence. Any careful student of the Gospel records of the resurrection will readily detect many marks of the eye witness. Some years ago when lecturing at an American university, a gentleman was introduced to me as being a skeptic. I asked him, "What line of study are you pursuing?" He replied that he was pursuing a post graduate course in history with a view to a professorship in history. I said, "Then you know that the account of an eye witness differs in marked respects from the account of one who is simply telling what he has heard from others?" "Yes," he replied. I next asked, "Have you carefully read the four Gospel accounts of the resurrection of Christ?" He replied, "I have." "Tell me, have you not noticed clear indications that they were derived from eye witnesses?" "Yes," he replied, "I have

been greatly struck by this in reading the accounts." Any one who carefully and intelligently reads them will be struck with the same fact.

3. The third thing that we notice about these Gospel narratives is *their naturalness, straightforwardness, artlessness and simplicity.*

The accounts, it is true, have to do with the supernatural, but the accounts themselves are most natural. There is a remarkable absence of all attempt at coloring and effect. There is nothing but the simple, straightforward telling of facts as they actually occurred. It frequently happens that when a witness is on the witness stand, the story he tells is so artless, so straightforward, so natural, there is such an entire absence of any attempt at coloring or effect that his testimony bears weight independently of anything we may know of the character or previous history of the witness. As we listen to his story, we say to ourselves, "This man is telling the truth." The weight of this kind of evidence is greatly increased and reaches practical certainty when we have several independent witnesses of this sort, all bearing testimony to the same essential facts, but with varieties of detail, one omitting what another tells, and the third unconsciously reconciling apparent discrepancies between the two. This is the precise case with the four Gospel narratives of the resurrection of Christ. The Gospel writers do not seem to have reflected at all upon the meaning or bearing of many of the facts which they relate. They simply tell right out what they saw in all simplicity and straightforwardness, leaving the philosophizing to others. Dr. William Furness, the great Unitarian scholar and critic, who certainly was not over-much disposed in favor of the supernatural, says, "Nothing can exceed in artlessness and simplicity the four accounts of the first appearance of Jesus after His crucifixion. If these qualities are not discernible here, we must despair of ever being able to discern them anywhere."

Suppose we should find four accounts of the battle of Monmouth. Suppose, furthermore, that nothing decisive was known as to the authorship of these four accounts, but, when we laid them side by side, we found that they were manifestly independent accounts. We found, furthermore, striking indications that they were from eye witnesses. We found them all marked by that artlessness, straightforwardness and simplicity that always carries conviction; we found that, while apparently disagreeing in minor details, they agreed substantially in their account of the battle—even though we had no knowledge of the authorship or date of these accounts, would we not, in the absence of any other accounts, say, "Here is a true account of the battle of Monmouth?" Now this is exactly the case with the four Gospel narratives. Manifestly separate and independent from one another, bearing the clear marks of having been derived from eye witnesses, characterized by an unparalleled artlessness, simplicity and straightforwardness, apparently disagreeing in minor details, but in perfect agreement as to the great central facts related. If we are fair and honest, if we follow the canons of evidence followed in court, if we follow any sound and sane law of literary and historical criticism, are we not logically driven to say, "Here is a true account of the resurrection of Jesus." Here again we might rest our case and call the resurrection of Jesus from the dead proven, but we go on still further:

4. The next thing we notice is the *unintentional evidence of words, phrases, and accidental details.*

It oftentimes happens that when a witness is on the stand, the unintentional evidence that he bears by words and phrases which he uses, and by accidental details which he introduces, is more convincing than his direct testimony, because it is not the testimony of the witness, but a testimony of the truth to itself. The Gospel accounts abound in evidence of this sort.

Take, as the first instance, the fact that in all the Gospel records of the resurrection, we are given to understand that Jesus was not at first recognized by His disciples when He appeared to them after His resurrection, e. g., Luke 24:16; John 21:4. We are not told why this was so, but if we will think awhile over it, we will soon discover why it was so. But the Gospel narratives simply record the fact without attempting to explain it. If the stories were fictitious, they certainly would never have been made up in this way, for the writer would have seen at once the objection that would arise in the minds of those who did not wish to believe in His resurrection, that is, that it was not really Jesus Whom the disciples saw. Why, then, is the story told in this way? For the self-evident reason that the evangelists were not making up a story for effect, but simply recording events precisely as they occurred. This is the way in which it occurred, therefore this is the way in which they told it. It is not a fabrication of imaginary incidents, but an exact record of facts carefully observed and accurately recorded.

Take a second instance: In all the Gospel records of the appearances of Jesus after His resurrection, there is not a single recorded appearance to an enemy or opponent of Christ. All His appearances were to those who were already believers. Why this was so we can easily see by a little thought, but nowhere in the Gospels are we told why it was so. If the stories had been fabricated, they certainly would never have been made up in this way. If the Gospels were, as some would have us believe, fabrications constructed one hundred, two hundred, or three hundred years after the alleged events recorded, when all the actors were dead and gone and no one could gainsay any lies told, Jesus would have been represented as appearing to Caiaphas, and Annas, and Pilate, and Herod, and confounding them by His re-appearance from the dead. But there is no suggestion even of anything of this kind in the Gospel stories. Every appearance is to

one who is already a believer. Why is this so? For the self-evident reason that this was the way that things occurred, and the Gospel narratives are not concerned with producing a story for effect, but simply with recording events precisely as they occurred and as they were observed.

We find still another instance in the fact that the recorded appearances of Jesus after His resurrection were only occasional. He would appear in the midst of His disciples and disappear, and not be seen again perhaps for several days. Why this was so, we can easily think out for ourselves—He was evidently seeking to wean His disciples from their old-time communion with Him in the body, and to prepare them for the communion with Himself in the Spirit that was to follow in the days that were to come. We are not, however, told this in the Gospel narratives. We are left to discover it for ourselves, and this is all the more significant for that reason. It is doubtful if the disciples themselves realized the meaning of the facts. If they had been making up the story to produce effect, they would have represented Jesus as being with them constantly, as living with them, eating and drinking with them, day after day. Why then is the story told as recorded in the four Gospels? Because this is the way in which it had all occurred. The Gospel writers are simply concerned with giving the exact representation of the facts as witnessed by themselves and others.

We find another very striking instance in what is recorded concerning the words of Jesus to Mary at their first meeting. (John 20:17.) Jesus is recorded as saying to Mary, "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to My Father." We are not told why Jesus said this to Mary. We are left to discover the reason for it if we can, and the commentators have had a great deal of trouble in discovering it. Their explanations vary widely one from another. I have a reason of my own which I have never seen in any commentary, but which I am persuaded is the true reason, but it would prob-

ably be difficult to persuade others that it was the true reason. Why then is this little utterance of Jesus put in the Gospel record without a word of explanation, and which it has taken eighteen centuries to explain, and which is not altogether satisfactorily explained yet? Certainly a writer making up a story would not put in a little detail like that without apparent meaning and without an attempt at an explanation of it. Stories that are made up are made up for a purpose; details that are inserted are inserted for a purpose, a purpose more or less evident, but eighteen centuries of study have not been able to find out the purpose why this was inserted. Why then do we find it here? Because this is exactly what happened. This is what Jesus said; this is what Mary heard Jesus say; this is what Mary told, and therefore this is what John recorded. We cannot have a fiction here, but an accurate record of words spoken by Jesus after His resurrection.

We find still another instance in John 20:4-6: "So they ran both together; and the other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulchre. And he, stooping down and looking in, saw the linen clothes lying; yet went he not in. Then cometh Simon Peter following him, and went into the sepulchre, and seeth the linen clothes lie." This is all in striking keeping with what we know of the men from other sources. Mary, returning hurriedly from the tomb, bursts in upon the two disciples and cries, "They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid Him." John and Peter sprang to their feet and ran at the top of their speed to the tomb. John, the younger of the two disciples (it is all the more striking that the narrative does not tell us here that he was the younger of the two disciples), was fleeter of foot and outran Peter and reached the tomb first, but man of retiring and reverent disposition that he was (we are not told this here but we know it from a study of his personality as revealed elsewhere) he did not

enter the tomb, but simply stooped down and looked in. Impetuous but older Peter comes lumbering on behind as fast as he can, but when once he reaches the tomb, he never waits a moment outside but plunges headlong in. Is this made up, or, is it life? He was indeed a literary artist of consummate ability who had the skill to make this up if it did not occur just so. There is incidentally a touch of local coloring in the report. When one visits today the tomb which scholars now accept as the real burial place of Jesus, he will find himself unconsciously obliged to stoop down in order to look in.

Still another instance is found in John 21:7: "Therefore, that disciple whom Jesus loved saith to Peter, It is the Lord. Now when Simon Peter heard that it was the Lord, he girt his fisher's coat unto him, (for he was naked,) and did cast himself into the sea." Here again we have the unmistakable marks of truth and life. The Apostles had gone at Jesus' command into Galilee to meet Him there, but Jesus does not at once appear. Simon Peter, with the fisherman's passion still stirring in his bosom says, "I go a-fishing." The others replied, "We also go with thee." They fished all night, and, with characteristic fishermen's luck, caught nothing. In the early dawn Jesus stands upon the shore, but the disciples did not recognize Him in the dim light. Jesus calls to them, "Children, have ye any meat?" And they answer, "No." He bids them cast the net on the right side of the ship and they will find. When the cast was made, they were not able to draw it for the multitude of fishes. In an instant, John, the man of quick spiritual perception, says, "It is the Lord." No sooner does Peter, the man of impulsive action, hear it than he grasps his fisher's coat, casts it about his naked form and throws himself overboard and strikes out for shore to reach his Lord. Is this made up, or, is it life? This is not fiction. If some unknown author of the fourth Gospel made this up, he is the master literary artist of the ages, and we

should take down every other name from our literary pantheon and place him above them all.

We find a still more touching instance in John 20:15: "Jesus saith unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? whom seekest thou? She, supposing Him to be the gardener, saith unto Him, Sir, if thou hast borne Him hence, tell me where thou hast laid Him, and I will take Him away." Here is surely a touch that surpasses the art of any man of that day or any other day. Mary had gone into the city and notified John and Peter that she had found the sepulchre empty. They start on a run for the sepulchre. As Mary has already made the journey twice, they easily far outstrip her, but with heavy heart and slow and weary feet, she makes her way back to the tomb. Peter and John have long gone when she reaches it, broken-hearted, thinking that not only has her beloved Lord been slain, but that His tomb has been desecrated. She stands without weeping. There are two angels sitting in the tomb, one at the head and the other at the feet where the body of Jesus had lain. But the grief-stricken woman has no eye for angels. They say unto her, "Woman, why weepest thou?" She replies, "Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid Him." A rustle in the leaves at her back and she turns around to see who is coming. She sees Jesus standing there, but, blinded by tears and despair, she does not recognize her Lord. Jesus also says to her, "Why weepest thou? Whom seekest thou?" She, supposing it to be the gardener who is talking to her, says, "Sir, if thou hast borne Him hence, tell me where thou hast laid Him and I will take Him away." Now remember who it is that makes the offer, and what she offers to do; a weak woman offers to carry a full grown man away. Of course, she could not do it, but how true to a woman's love that always forgets its weakness and never stops at impossibilities. There is something to be done and she says, "I will do it," "Tell me where thou hast laid Him, and I will take Him

away." Is this made up? Never! This is life; this is reality; this is truth.

We find another instance in Mark 16:7: "But go your way, tell His disciples *and Peter* that He goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see Him, as He said unto you." What I would have you notice here are the two words, *"and Peter."* Why *"and Peter?"* Was not Peter one of the disciples? Surely he was, the very head of the apostolic company. Why then, "and Peter?" No explanation is given in the text, but reflection shows it was the utterance of love toward the despondent, despairing disciple who had thrice denied his Lord. If the message had been simply to the disciples Peter would have said, "Yes, I was once a disciple, but I can no longer be counted such. I thrice denied my Lord on that awful night with oaths and curses. It does not mean me." But our tender compassionate Lord through His angelic messenger sends the message, "Go tell His disciples, and whoever you tell, be sure you tell poor, weak, faltering, backslidden, broken-hearted Peter." Is this made up, or is this a real picture of our Lord? I pity the man who is so dull that he can imagine this is fiction. Incidentally let it be noted that this is recorded only in the Gospel of Mark, which, as is well known, is Peter's Gospel. As Peter dictated to Mark one day what he should record, with tearful eyes and grateful heart he would turn to him and say, "Mark, be sure you put that in, 'Tell His disciples *and Peter.*'"

Take still another instance in John 20:27-29: "Then saith He to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold My hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into My side; and be not faithless but believing. And Thomas answered and said unto Him, My Lord and my God. Jesus saith unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen Me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed." Note here two things; the action of Thomas and the rebuke of Jesus. Each is too characteristic to be attributed to the

art of some master of fiction. Thomas had not been with the disciples at the first appearance of our Lord. A week had passed by. Another Lord's Day had come. This time Thomas makes sure of being present; if the Lord is to appear, he will be there. If he had been like some of our modern doubters, he would have taken pains to be away, but, doubter though he was, he was an honest doubter and wanted to know. Suddenly Jesus stands in the midst. He says to Thomas, "Reach hither thy finger, and behold My hands, and reach thither thy hand, and thrust it into My side: and be not faithless but believing." At last Thomas' eyes are opened. His faith long dammed back bursts every barrier and sweeping onward carries Thomas to a higher height than any other disciple had as yet reached—exultingly and adoringly he cries, as he looks up into the face of Jesus, "My Lord and My God!" Then Jesus tenderly, but searchingly, rebukes him. "Thomas," He says, "because thou hast seen Me, thou hast believed. Blessed are they [who are so eager to find and so quick to see, and so ready to accept the truth, that they do not wait for actual visible demonstration but are ready to take truth on sufficient testimony] that have not seen and yet have believed." Is this made up, or is this life? Is it a record of facts as they occurred, or a fictitious production of some master artist?

Take still another instance: In John 21:15-17 we read: "So when they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these? He saith unto Him, Yea, Lord; Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith unto him, Feed My lambs. He saith unto him again the second time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me? He saith unto Him, Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith unto him, Feed My sheep. He saith unto him *the third time,* Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me? Peter *was grieved because He said unto him the third time,* Lovest thou Me? And he said unto Him, Lord, Thou knowest all things;

Thou knowest that I love Thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed My sheep." Note especially here the words, "Peter was grieved because He said unto him *the third time,* Lovest thou Me?" Why did Jesus ask Peter three times, "Lovest thou Me?" And why was Peter grieved because Jesus did ask him three times? We are not told in the text, but, if we read it in the light of Peter's thrice repeated denial of his Lord, we will understand it. As Peter had denied his Lord thrice, Jesus three times gave Peter an opportunity to reassert his love. But this, tender as it was, brings back to Peter that awful night when in the courtyard of Annas and Caiaphas, he thrice denied his Lord, and "Peter was grieved because He said unto him the third time, Lovest thou Me." Is this made up? Did the writer make it up with this fact in view? If he did, he surely would have mentioned it. It cannot have been made up. It is not fiction. It is simply reporting what actually occurred. The accurate truthfulness of the record comes out even more strikingly in the Greek than in the English version. Two different words are used for "love." Jesus, in asking Peter, "Lovest thou Me?" uses a strong word denoting the higher form of love. Peter, replying, "Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee," uses a weaker word, but one denoting a more tender form of love. Jesus, the second time uses the stronger word, and the second time in his reply Peter uses the weaker word. In His third question, Jesus comes down to Peter's level and uses the weaker word that Peter had used from the beginning. Then Peter replies, "Lord, Thou knowest all things, Thou knowest that I love Thee," using the same weaker word. This cannot be fiction. It is accurately reported fact.

Take still another instance: In John 20:16 we read, "Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turned herself and saith unto Him, Rabboni; which is to say, Master." What a delicate touch of nature we have here! Mary is standing outside the tomb overcome with grief. She has not recognized her

Lord, though He has spoken to her. She has mistaken Him for the gardener. She has said, "Sir, if thou hast borne Him hence, tell me where thou hast laid Him, and I will take Him away." Then Jesus utters just one word. He says, "Mary." As that name came trembling on the morning air, uttered with the old familiar tone, spoken as no one else had ever spoken it but He, in an instant her eyes were opened. She falls at His feet and tries to clasp them, and looks up into His face, and cries, "Rabboni, my Master." Is this made up? Impossible! This is life. This is Jesus, and this is the woman who loved Him. No unknown author of the second, third, or fourth century, could have produced such a masterpiece as this. We stand here unquestionably face to face with reality, with life, with Jesus and Mary as they actually were.

One more important illustration: In John 20:7 we read, "And the napkin, that was about His head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself." How strange that such a little detail as this should be added to the story with absolutely no attempt at explaining. But how deeply significant this little unexplained detail is. Recall the circumstances. Jesus is dead. For three days and three nights his body is lying cold and silent in the sepulchre, as truly dead as any body was ever dead, but at last the appointed hour has come, the breath of God sweeps through the sleeping and silent clay, and in that supreme moment of His own earthly life, that supreme moment of human history, when Jesus rises triumphant over death and grave and Satan, there is no excitement upon His part, but with that same majestic self-composure and serenity that marked His whole career, that same Divine calm that He displayed upon storm-tossed Galilee, when His affrighted disciples shook Him from His slumbers and said, "Lord, carest thou not that we perish?" and He arose serenely on the deck of the tossing vessel and said to the wild, tempestuous waves and

winds, "Be still," and there was a great calm: so now again in this sublime, this awful moment, He does not excitedly tear the napkin from His face and fling it aside, but absolutely without human haste or flurry, or disorder, He unties it calmly from His head, rolls it up and lays it away in an orderly manner in a place by itself. Was that made up? Never! We do not behold here an exquisite masterpiece of the romancer's art; we read here the simple narrative of a matchless detail in a unique life that was actually lived here upon earth, a life so beautiful that one cannot read it with an honest and open mind without feeling the tears coming into his eyes.

But some one will say, all these are little things. True, and it is from that very fact that they gain much of their significance. It is just in such little things that fiction would disclose itself. Fiction displays itself different from fact in the minute; in the great outstanding outlines you can make fiction look like truth, but when you come to examine it minutely and microscopically, you will soon detect that it is not reality but fabrication. But the more miscroscopically we examine the Gospel narratives, the more we become impressed with their truthfulness. There is an artlessness and naturalness and self-evident truthfulness in the narratives, down to the minutest detail, that surpasses all the possibilities of art.

The third line of proof that the statements contained in the four Gospels regarding the resurrection of Jesus Christ are exact statements of historic fact, is

III. THE CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE FOR THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST

There are certain proven and admitted facts that demand the resurrection of Christ to account for them.

1. Beyond a question, the foundation truth preached in the early years of the Church's history was the resurrection. This was the one doctrine upon which the Apostles were ever

ringing the changes. Whether Jesus did actually rise from the dead or not, it is certain that the one thing that the Apostles constantly proclaimed was that He had risen. Why should the Apostles use this as the very corner-stone of their creed, if not well attested and firmly believed?

But this is not all: They laid down their lives for this doctrine. Men never lay down their lives for a doctrine which they do not firmly believe. They stated that they had seen Jesus after His resurrection, and rather than give up their statement, they laid down their lives for it. Of course, men may die for error and often have, but it was for error that they firmly believed. In this case they would have known whether they had seen Jesus or not, and they would not merely have been dying for error but dying for a statement which they knew to be false. This is not only incredible but impossible. Furthermore, if the Apostles really firmly believed, as is admitted, that Jesus rose from the dead, they had some facts upon which they founded their belief. These would have been the facts that they would have related in recounting the story. They certainly would not have made up a story out of imaginary incidents when they had real facts upon which they founded their belief. But if the facts were as recounted in the Gospels, there is no possible escaping the conclusion that Jesus actually arose. Still further, if Jesus had not arisen, there would have been evidence that He had not. His enemies would have sought and found this evidence, but the Apostles went up and down the very city where He had been crucified and proclaimed right to the faces of His slayers that He had been raised and no one could produce evidence to the contrary. The very best they could do was to say the guards went to sleep and the disciples stole the body while the guards slept. Men who bear evidence of what happens while they are asleep are not usually regarded as credible witnesses. Further still, if the Apostles had stolen the body, they would have known it them-

selves and would not have been ready to die for what they knew to be a fraud.

2. Another known fact is the change in the day of rest. The early church came from among the Jews. From time immemorial the Jews had celebrated the seventh day of the week as their day of rest and worship, but we find the early Christians in the Acts of the Apostles, and also in early Christian writings, assembling on the first day of the week. Nothing is more difficult of accomplishment than the change in a holy day that has been celebrated for centuries and is one of the most cherished customs of the people. What is especially significant about the change is that it was changed by no express decree but by general consent. Something tremendous must have occurred that led to this change. The Apostles asserted that what had occurred on that day was the resurrection of Christ from the dead, and that is the most rational explanation. In fact it is the only reasonable explanation of the change.

3. But the most significant fact of all is the change in the disciples themselves, the moral transformation. At the time of the crucifixion of Christ, we find the whole apostolic company filled with blank and utter despair. We see Peter, the leader of the apostolic company, denying his Lord three times with oaths and cursings, but a few days later we see this same man, filled with a courage that nothing could shake. We see him standing before the council that had condemned Jesus to death and saying to them, "Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by Him doth this man stand before you whole" (Acts 4:10). A little further on when commanded by the council not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus, we hear Peter and John answering, "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the

things which we have seen and heard" (Acts 4:19, 20). A little later still after arrest and imprisonment, in peril of death, when sternly arraigned by the council, we hear Peter and the Apostles answering their demand that they should be silent regarding Jesus, with the words, "We ought to obey God rather than man. *The God of our fathers raised up Jesus whom ye slew and hanged* on a tree. Him hath God exalted with His right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins. And we are His witnesses of these things" (Acts 5:29-32). Something tremendous must have occurred to account for such a radical and astounding moral transformation as this. Nothing short of the fact of the resurrection and of their having seen the risen Lord will explain it.

These unquestionable facts are so impressive and so conclusive that even infidel and Jewish scholars now admit that the Apostles believed that Jesus rose from the dead. Even Ferdinand Baur, father of the Tübigen School, admitted this. Even David Strauss, who wrote the most masterly "Life of Jesus" from the rationalistic standpoint that was ever written, said, "Only this much need be acknowledged that the Apostles firmly believed that Jesus had arisen." Strauss evidently did not wish to admit any more than he had to but he felt compelled to admit this much. Schenkel went even further and said, "It is an indisputable fact that in the early morning of the first day of the week following the crucifixion, the grave of Jesus was found empty. It is a second fact that the disciples and other members of the apostolic communion were convinced that Jesus was seen after the crucifixion." These admissions are fatal to the rationalists who make them. The question at once arises, "Whence these convictions and belief?" Renan attempted an answer by saying that "the passion of a hallucinated woman (Mary) gives to the world a resurrected God." (Renan's "Life of Jesus," page 357.) By this, Renan means that Mary was in love

with Jesus; that after His crucifixion, brooding over it, in the passion of her love, she dreamed herself into a condition where she had a hallucination that she had seen Jesus risen from the dead. She reported her dream as a fact, and thus the passion of a hallucinated woman gave to the world a resurrected God. But the reply to all this is self-evident, namely, the passion of a hallucinated woman was not competent to this task. Remember the make-up of the apostolic company; in the apostolic company were a Matthew and a Thomas to be convinced, outside was a Saul of Tarsus to be converted. The passion of a hallucinated woman will not convince a stubborn unbeliever like Thomas, nor a Jewish tax-gatherer like Matthew. Whoever heard of a tax-gatherer, and most of all of a Jewish tax-gatherer, who could be imposed upon by the passion of a hallucinated woman? Neither will the passion of a hallucinated woman convince a fierce and conscientious enemy like Saul of Tarsus. We must look for some saner explanation than this. Strauss tried to account for it by inquiring whether the appearance might not have been visionary. Strauss has had, and still has, many followers in this theory. But to this we reply, first of all, there was no subjective starting point for such visions. The Apostles, so far from expecting to see the Lord, would scarcely believe their own eyes when they did see Him. Furthermore, whoever heard of eleven men having the same vision at the same time, to say nothing of five hundred men (1 Cor. 15:6) having the same vision at the same time. Strauss demands of us that we give up one reasonable miracle and substitute five hundred impossible miracles in its place. Nothing can surpass the credulity of unbelief.

The third attempt at an explanation is that Jesus was not really dead when they took Him from the cross, that His friends worked over Him and brought Him back to life, and what was supposed to be the appearance of the raised Lord

was the appearance of one who never had been really dead and was now merely resuscitated. This theory of Paulus has been brought forward and revamped by various rationalistic writers in our own time and seems to be a favorite theory of those who today would deny the reality of our Lord's resurrection. To sustain this view, appeal has been made to the short time Jesus hung upon the cross and to the fact that history tells us of one in the time of Josephus taken down from the cross and nursed back to life. But to this we answer: (1). Remember the events preceding the crucifixion; the agony in the garden of Gethsemane; the awful ordeal of the four trials; the scourging and the consequent physical condition in which all this left Jesus. Remember too the water and the blood that poured from His pierced side. (2). In the second place, we reply, His enemies would have taken, and did take, all necessary precautions against such a thing as this happening. (John 19:34.) (3). We reply, in the third place, if Jesus had been merely resuscitated, He would have been so weak, such an utter physical wreck, that His re-appearance would have been measured at its real value, and the moral transformation in the disciples, for which we are trying to account, would still remain unaccounted for. The officer in the time of Josephus, who is cited in proof, though brought back to life, was an utter physical wreck. (4). We reply in the fourth place, if brought back to life, the Apostles and friends of Jesus, who are the ones who are supposed to have brought Him back to life, would have known how they brought Him back to life, and that it was not a case of resurrection but of resuscitation, and the main fact to be accounted for, namely, the change in themselves would remain unaccounted for. The attempted explanation is an explanation that does not explain. (5). In the fifth place, we reply, that the moral difficulty is the greatest of all, for if it was really a case of resuscitation, then Jesus tried to palm Himself off as one risen from the dead, when in reality He was nothing

of the sort. In that case, He would be an arch-impostor, and the whole Christian system rests on a fraud as its ultimate foundation. Is it possible to believe that such a system of religion as that of Jesus Christ, embodying such exalted principles and precepts of truth, purity and love, "originated in a deliberately planned fraud"? No one whose own heart is not cankered by fraud and trickery can believe Jesus to have been an impostor, and His religion to have been founded upon fraud. A leader of the rationalistic forces in England has recently tried to prove the theory that Jesus was only apparently dead by appealing to the fact that when the side of Jesus was pierced blood came forth and asks, "Can a dead man bleed?" To this the sufficient reply is that when a man dies of what is called in popular language, a broken heart, the blood escapes into the pericardium, and after standing there for a short time it separates into serum (the water) and clot (the red corpuscles, blood), and thus if a man were dead, if his side were pierced by a spear, and the point of the spear entered the pericardium, "blood and water" would flow out just as the record states it did, and what is brought forth as a proof that Jesus was not really dead, is in reality a proof that He was, and an illustration of the minute accuracy of the story. It could not have been made up in this way, if it were not actual fact.

We have eliminated all other possible suppositions. We have but one left, namely, Jesus really was raised from the dead the third day as recorded in the four Gospels. The desperate straits to which those who attempt to deny it are driven are themselves proof of the fact.

We have then several independent lines of argument pointing decisively and conclusively to the resurrection of Christ from the dead. Some of them taken separately prove the fact, but taken together they constitute an argument that makes doubt of the resurrection of Christ impossible to the candid mind. Of course, if one is determined not to

believe, no amount of proof will convince him. Such a man must be left to his own deliberate choice of error and falsehood; but any man who really desires to know the truth and is willing to obey it at any cost must accept the resurrection of Christ as an historically proven fact.

A brilliant lawyer in New York City some time ago spoke to a prominent minister of that city asking him if he really believed that Christ rose from the dead. The minister replied that he did, and asked the privilege of presenting the proof to the lawyer. The lawyer took the material offered in proof away and studied it. He returned to the minister, and said, "I am convinced that Jesus really did rise from the dead. But," he then added, "I am no nearer being a Christian than I was before. I thought that the difficulty was with my head. I find that it is really with my heart."

There is really but one weighty objection to the doctrine that Jesus arose from the dead, and that is, "There is no conclusive evidence that any other ever arose." To this a sufficient answer would be, even if it were certain that no other ever arose, it would not at all prove that Jesus did not arise, for the life of Jesus was unique, His nature was unique, His character was unique, His mission was unique, His history was unique, and it is not to be wondered at, but rather to be expected, that the issue of such a life should also be unique. However, all this objection is simply David Hume's exploded argument against the possibility of the miraculous revamped. According to this argument, no amount of evidence can prove a miracle, because miracles are contrary to all experience. But are miracles contrary to all experience? To start out by saying that they are is to beg the very question at issue. They may be outside of your experience and mine, they may be outside the experience of this entire generation, but your experience and mine and the experience of this entire generation is not "all experience." Every student of geology and astronomy knows that things

have occurred in the past which are entirely outside of the experience of the present generation. Things have occurred within the last ten years that are entirely outside of the experience of the fifty years preceding it. True science does not start with an *a priori* hypothesis that certain things are impossible, but simply examines the evidence to find out what has actually occurred. It does not twist its observed facts to make them accord with *a priori* theories, but seeks to make its theories accord with the facts as observed. To say that miracles are impossible, and that no amount of evidence can prove a miracle, is to be supremely unscientific. Within the past few years, in the domain of chemistry for example, discoveries have been made regarding radium which seemed to run counter to all previous observations regarding chemical elements and to well established chemical theories. But the scientist has not therefore said that these discoveries about radium cannot be true; he has rather gone to work to find out where the trouble was in his previous theories. The observed and recorded facts in the case before us prove to a demonstration that Jesus rose from the dead, and true science must accept this conclusion and conform its theories to this observed fact. The fact of the actual and literal resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead cannot be denied by any man who will study the evidence in the case with a candid desire to find what the fact is, and not merely to support an *a priori* theory.

CHAPTER XV

THE PERSONALITY AND DEITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

BY REV. R. A. TORREY, D. D.

IMPORTANCE OF THE DOCTRINE

One of the most characteristic and distinctive doctrines of the Christian faith is that of the personality and deity of the Holy Spirit. The doctrine of the personality of the Holy Spirit is of the highest importance from the standpoint of worship. If the Holy Spirit is a divine person, worthy to receive our adoration, our faith and our love, and we do not know and recognize Him as such, then we are robbing a divine Being of the adoration and love and confidence which are His due.

The doctrine of the personality of the Holy Spirit is also of the highest importance from the practical standpoint. If we think of the Holy Spirit only as an impersonal power or influence, then our thought will constantly be, how can I get hold of and use the Holy Spirit; but if we think of Him in the Biblical way as a divine Person, infinitely wise, infinitely holy, infinitely tender, then our thought will constantly be, "How can the Holy Spirit get hold of and use me?" Is there no difference between the thought of the worm using God to thrash the mountain, or God using the worm to thrash the mountain? The former conception is low and heathenish, not differing essentially from the thought of the African fetich worshipper who uses his god to do his will. The latter conception is lofty and Christian. If we think of the Holy Spirit merely as a power or influence, our thought will be, "How can I get more of the Holy Spirit?"; but if we think of Him as a divine Person, our thought will be, "How can the Holy Spirit get more of me?" The former conception leads to self-exalta-

tion; the latter conception to self-humiliation, self-emptying and self-renunciation. If we think of the Holy Spirit merely as a Divine power or influence and then imagine that we have received the Holy Spirit, there will be the temptation to feel as if we belonged to a superior order of Christians. A woman once came to me to ask a question and began by saying, "Before I ask the question, I want you to understand that I am a Holy Ghost woman." The words and the manner of uttering them made me shudder. I could not believe that they were true. But if we think of the Holy Spirit in the Biblical way as a divine Being of infinite majesty, condescending to dwell in our hearts and take possession of our lives, it will put us in the dust, and make us walk very softly before God.

It is of the highest importance from an experimental standpoint that we know the Holy Spirit as a person. Many can testify of the blessing that has come into their own lives from coming to know the Holy Spirit, as an ever-present, living divine Friend and Helper.

There are four lines of proof in the Bible that the Holy Spirit is a person.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

1. *All the distinctive characteristics of personality are ascribed to the Holy Spirit in the Bible.*

What are the distinctive characteristics or marks of personality? Knowledge, feeling and will. Any being who knows and feels and wills is a person. When you say that the Holy Spirit is a person, some understand you to mean that the Holy Spirit has hands and feet and eyes and nose, and so on, but these are the marks, not of personality, but of corporeity. When we say that the Holy Spirit is a person, we mean that He is not a mere influence or power that God sends into our lives but that He is a Being who knows and feels and wills. These three characteristics of personality, knowledge, feeling

and will, are ascribed to the Holy Spirit over and over again in the Scriptures.

KNOWLEDGE.

In 1 Cor. 2:10, 11 we read, "But God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God." Here "knowledge" is ascribed to the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is not merely an illumination that comes into our minds, but He is a Being who Himself knows the deep things of God and who teaches us what He Himself knows.

WILL.

We read again in 1 Cor. 12:11, R. V., "But all these worketh the one and the same Spirit, dividing to each one severally as He will." Here "will" is ascribed to the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is not a mere influence or power which we are to use according to our wills, but a Divine Person who uses us according to His will. This is a thought of fundamental importance in getting into right relations with the Holy Spirit. Many a Christian misses entirely the fullness of blessing that there is for him because he is trying to get the Holy Spirit to use Him according to his own foolish will, instead of surrendering himself to the Holy Spirit to be used according to His infinitely wise will. I rejoice that there is no divine power that I can get hold of and use according to my ignorant will. But how greatly do I rejoice that there is a Being of infinite wisdom who is willing to come into my heart and take possession of my life and use me according to His infinitely wise will.

MIND.

We read in Romans 8:27, "And He that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because He maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of

God." Here "mind" is ascribed to the Holy Spirit. The word here translated "mind" is a comprehensive word, including the ideas of thought, feeling and purpose. It is the same word used in Romans 8:7, where we read, "The carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." So then, in the passage quoted we have personality in the fullest sense ascribed to the Holy Spirit.

LOVE.

We read still further in Romans 15:30, "Now I beseech you, brethren, for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake and for the *love of the Spirit,* that ye strive together with me in your prayers to God for me." Here "love" is ascribed to the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is not a mere blind, unfeeling influence or power that comes into our lives. The Holy Spirit is a person who loves as tenderly as God, the Father, or Jesus Christ, the Son. Very few of us meditate as we ought upon the love of the Spirit. Every day of our lives we think of the love of God, the Father, and the love of Christ, the Son, but weeks and months go by, with some of us, without our thinking of the love of the Holy Spirit. Every day of our lives we kneel down and look up into the face of God, the Father and say, "I thank Thee, Father, for Thy great love that led Thee to send Thy only begotten Son down into this world to die an atoning sacrifice upon the cross of Calvary for me." Every day of our lives we kneel down and look up into the face of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, and say, "I thank Thee, Thou blessed Son of God, for that great love of Thine that led Thee to turn Thy back upon all the glory of heaven and to come down to all the shame and suffering of earth to bear my sins in Thine own body upon the cross." But how often do we kneel down and say to the Spirit, "I thank Thee, Thou infinite and eternal Spirit of God for Thy great love that led Thee in obedience to the Father and the Son to come into this world and seek me

out in my lost estate, and to follow me day after day and week after week and year after year until Thou hadst brought me to see my need of a Saviour, and hadst revealed to me Jesus Christ as just the Saviour I needed, and hadst brought me to a saving knowledge of Him." Yet we owe our salvation just as truly to the love of the Spirit as we do to the love of the Father and the love of the Son.

If it had not been for the love of God, the Father, looking down upon me in my lost condition, yes, anticipating my fall and ruin, and sending His only begotten Son to make full atonement for my sin, I should have been a lost man today. If it had not been for the love of the eternal Word of God, coming down into this world in obedience to the Father's commandment and laying down His life as an atoning sacrifice for my sin on the cross of Calvary, I should have been a lost man today. But just as truly, if it had not been for the love of the Holy Spirit, coming into this world in obedience to the Father and the Son and seeking me out in all my ruin and following me with never-wearying patience and love day after day and week after week and month after month and year after year, following me into places that it must have been agony for Him to go, wooing me though I resisted Him and insulted Him and persistently turned my back upon Him, following me and never giving me up until at last He had opened my eyes to see that I was utterly lost and then revealed Jesus Christ to me as an all-sufficient Saviour, and then imparted to me power to make this Saviour mine; if it had not been for this long-suffering, patient, never-wearying, yearning and unspeakably tender love of the Spirit to me, I should have been a lost man today.

INTELLIGENCE AND GOODNESS.

Again we read in Neh. 9:20, R. V., "Thou gavest also Thy good Spirit to instruct them, and withheldest not Thy manna from their mouth, and gavest them water for their thirst." Here "intelligence" and "goodness" are ascribed to the Holy

Spirit. This does not add any new thought to the passages already considered, but we bring it in here because it is from the Old Testament. There are those who tell us that the personality of the Holy Spirit is not found in the Old Testament This passage of itself, to say nothing of others, shows us that this is a mistake. While the truth of the personality of the Holy Spirit naturally is not as fully developed in the Old Testament as in the New, none the less the thought is there and distinctly there.

GRIEF.

We read again in Ephesians 4:30, "And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption." In this passage "grief" is ascribed to the Holy Spirit The Holy Spirit is not a mere impersonal influence or power that God sends into our lives. He is a person who comes to dwell in our hearts, observing all that we do and say and think And if there is anything in act or word or thought, or fleeting imagination that is impure, unkind, selfish, or evil in any way He is deeply grieved by it.

This thought once fully comprehended becomes one of the mightiest motives to a holy life and a careful walk. How many a young man, who has gone from a holy, Christian home to the great city with its many temptations, has been kept back from doing things that he would otherwise do by the thought that if he did them his mother might hear of it and that it would grieve her beyond description. But there is One who dwells in our hearts, if we are believers in Christ, who goes with us wherever we go, sees everything that we do, hears everything that we say, observes every thought, even the most fleeting fancy, and this One is purer than the holiest mother that ever lived, more sensitive against sin. One who recoils from the slightest sin as the purest woman who ever lived upon this earth never recoiled from sin in its most hideous forms; and, if there is anything in act, or word, or thought, that has

the slighest taint of evil in it, He is grieved beyond description How often some evil thought is suggested to us and we are about to give entertainment to it and then the thought, "The Holy Spirit sees that and is deeply grieved by it," leads us to banish it forever from our mind.

THE ACTS OF THE SPIRIT.

2. The second line of proof in the Bible of the personality of the Holy Spirit is that *many acts that only a person can perform are ascribed to the Holy Spirit.*

SEARCHING, SPEAKING AND PRAYING.

For example, we read in 1 Cor. 2:10 that the Holy Spirit searcheth the deep things of God. Here He is represented not merely as an illumination that enables us to understand the deep things of God, but a person who Himself searches into the deep things of God and reveals to us the things which He discovers. In Rev. 2:7 and many other passages, the Holy Spirit is represented as speaking. In Gal. 4:6, He is represented as crying out. In Romans 8:26, R. V., we read, "And in like manner the Spirit also helpeth our infirmity: for we know not how to pray as we ought; but the Spirit Himself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered." Here the Holy Spirit is represented to us as praying, not merely as an influence that leads us to pray, or an illumination that teaches us how to pray, but as a Person Who Himself prays in and through us. There is immeasurable comfort in the thought that every regenerate man or woman has two Divine Persons praying for him, Jesus Christ, the Son of God at the right hand of the Father praying for us (Heb. 7:25; 1 John 2:1); and the Holy Spirit praying through us down here. How secure and how blessed is the position of the believer with these two Divine Persons, whom the Father always hears, praying for him.

TEACHING AND GUIDING.

In John 15:26, 27, we read, "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify of me: And ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning." Here the Holy Spirit is very definitely set forth as a Person giving testimony, and a clear distinction is drawn between His testimony and the testimony which those in whom He dwells give. Again in John 14:26 we read, "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you." And again in John 16:12-14, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth: for He shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak: and He will show you things to come. He shall glorify me: for He shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you." (cf. also Neh. 9:20.) In these passages, the Holy Spirit is set forth as a teacher of the truth, not merely an illumination that enables our mind to see the truth, but One who personally comes to us and teaches us the truth. It is the privilege of the humblest believer to have a divine person as his daily teacher of the truth of God. (cf. 1 John 2:20, 27.)

In Romans 8:14 ("For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God") the Holy Spirit is represented as our personal guide, directing us what to do, taking us by the hand, as it were, and leading us into that line of action that is well-pleasing to God. In Acts 16:6, 7 we read these deeply significant words, "Now when they had gone throughout Phrygia and the region of Galatia, and were *forbidden of the Holy Ghost* to preach the word in Asia, after they were come to Mysia, they assayed to go into Bithynia: but *the Spirit suffered*

them not." Here the Holy Spirit is represented as taking command of the life and conduct of a servant of Jesus Christ. In Acts 13:2 and Acts 20:28, we see the Holy Spirit calling men to work and appointing them to office. Over and over again in the Scriptures actions are ascribed to the Holy Spirit which only a person could perform.

THE OFFICE OF THE SPIRIT.

3. The third line of proof of the personality of the Holy Spirit is that *an office is predicated to the Holy Spirit that could only be predicated of a person.*

"ANOTHER COMFORTER."

We read in John 14:16, 17, "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him: but ye know Him; for He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." Here we are told it is the office of the Holy Spirit to be "another Comforter" to take the place of our absent Saviour. Our Lord Jesus was about to leave His disciples. When He announced His departure to them, sorrow had filled their hearts (John 16:6). Jesus spoke words to comfort them. He told them that in the world to which He was going there was plenty of room for them also (John 14:2). He told them further that He was going to prepare that place for them (John 14:3) and that when He had thus prepared it, He was coming back for them; but He told them further that even during His absence, while He was preparing heaven for them, He would not leave them orphaned (John 14:18), but that He would pray the Father and the Father would send to them another Comforter to take His place. Is it possible that Jesus should have said this if that One Who was going to take His place after all was not a person, but only an influence or power, no matter how beneficent and divine? Still further, is it

conceivable that He should have said what He does say in John 16:7, "Nevertheless I tell you the truth; *It is expedient for you* that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but, if I depart, I will send Him unto you," if this other Comforter that was coming to take His place was only an influence or power?

ONE AT OUR SIDE.

This becomes clearer still when we bear in mind that the word translated "Comforter" means comforter plus a great deal more beside. The revisers found a great deal of difficulty in translating the Greek word. They have suggested "advocate," "helper" and a mere transference of the Greek word "Paraclete" into the English. The word so translated is *Parakletos,* the same word that is translated "advocate" in 1 John 2:1; but "advocate" does not give the full force and significance of the word etymologically. Advocate means about the same as *Parakletos,* but the word in usage has obtained restricted sense. "Advocate" is Latin; *Parakletos* is Greek. The exact Latin word is *"advocatus,"* which means one called to another. (That is, to help him or take his part or represent him.) *Parakletos* means one called alongside, that is, one who constantly stands by your side as your helper, counsellor, comforter, friend. It is very nearly the thought expressed in the familiar hymn, "Ever present, truest friend." Up to the time that Jesus had uttered these words, He Himself had been the *Parakletos* to the disciples, the Friend at hand, the Friend who stood by their side. When they got into any trouble, they turned to Him. On one occasion they desired to know how to pray and they turned to Jesus and said, "Lord, teach us to pray" (Luke 11:1). On another occasion Peter was sinking in the waves of Galilee and he cried, saying, "Lord, save me. And immediately Jesus stretched forth His hand, and caught him," and saved him (Matt. 14:30, 31) In every extremity they turned to Him. Just so now that Jesus

has gone to be with the Father, while we are awaiting His return, we have another Person just as divine as He, just as wise, just as strong, just as able to help, just as loving, always by our side and ready at any moment that we look to Him, to counsel us, to teach us, to help us, to give us victory, to take the entire control of our lives.

CURE FOR LONELINESS.

This is one of the most comforting thoughts in the New Testament for the present dispensation. Many of us, as we have read the story of how Jesus walked and talked with His disciples, have wished that we might have been there; but today we have a Person just as divine as Jesus, just as worthy of our confidence and our trust, right by our side to supply every need of our life. If this wonderful truth of the Bible once gets into our hearts and remains there, it will save us from all anxiety and worry. It is a cure for loneliness. Why need we ever be lonely, even though separated from the best of earthly friends, if we realize that a divine Friend is always by our side? It is a cure for breaking hearts. Many of us have been called upon to part with those earthly ones whom we most loved, and their going has left an aching void that it seemed no one and no thing could ever fill; but there is a divine Friend dwelling in the heart of the believer, who can, and who, if we look to Him to do it, will fill every nook and corner and every aching place in our hearts. It is a cure from the fear of darkness and of danger. No matter how dark the night and how many foes we may fear are lurking on every hand, there is a divine One who walks by our side and who can and will protect us from every danger. He can make the darkest night bright by the glory of His presence.

But it is in our service for Christ that this thought of the Holy Spirit comes to us with greatest helpfulness. Many of us do what service we do for the Master with fear and trembling. We are always afraid that we may say or do the wrong thing;

and so we have no joy or liberty in our service. When we stand up to preach, there is an awful sense of responsibility upon us. We tremble with the thought that we are not competent to do the work that we are called to do, and there is the constant fear that we shall not do it as it ought to be done. But if we can only remember that the responsibility is not really upon us but upon another, the Holy Spirit, and that He knows just what ought to be done and just what ought to be said, and then if we will get just as far back out of sight as possible and let Him do the work which He is so perfectly competent to do, our fears and our cares will vanish. All sense of constraint will go and the proclamation of God's truth will become a joy unspeakable, not a worrying care.

PERSONAL TESTIMONY.

Perhaps a word of personal testimony would be pardonable at this point. I entered the ministry because I was obliged to. My conversion turned upon my preaching. For years I refused to be a Christian because I was determined that I would not preach. The night I was converted, I did not say, "I will accept Christ," or anything of that sort. I said, "I will preach." But if any man was never fitted by natural temperament to preach, it was I. I was abnormally timid. I never even spoke in a public prayer meeting until after I had entered the theological seminary. My first attempt to do so was an agonizing experience. In my early ministry I wrote my sermons out and committed them to memory, and when the evening service would close and I had uttered the last word of the sermon, I would sink back with a sense of great relief that that was over for another week. Preaching was torture. But the glad day came when I got hold of the thought, and the thought got hold of me, that when I stood up to preach another stood by my side, and though the audience saw me, the responsibility was really upon Him and that He was perfectly competent to bear it, and all I had to do was to stand back and get as far out of sight as

possible and let Him do the work which the Father sent Him to do. From that day preaching has not been a burden nor a duty but a glad privilege. I have no anxiety nor care. I know that He is conducting the service and doing it just as it ought to be done, and even though things sometimes may not seem to go just as I think they ought, I know they have gone right. Often times when I get up to preach and the thought takes possession of me that He is there to do it all, such a joy fills my heart that I feel like shouting for very ecstasy.

TREATMENT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

4. The fourth line of proof of the personality of the Holy Spirit is: *a treatment is predicated of the Holy Spirit that could only be predicated of a person.*

We read in Isa. 63:10, R. V., "But they rebelled and grieved His Holy Spirit: therefore he was turned to be their enemy, and Himself fought against them." Here we see that the Holy Spirit is rebelled against and grieved. (Cf. Eph. 4:30.) You cannot rebel against a mere influence or power. You can only rebel against and grieve a person. Still further we read in Heb. 10:29, "Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith He was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?" Here we are told that the Holy Spirit is "done despite unto," that is "treated with contumely." (Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament.) You cannot "treat with contumely" an influence or power, only a person. Whenever a truth is presented to our thought, it is the Holy Spirit who presents it. If we refuse to listen to that truth, then we turn our backs deliberately upon that divine Person who presents it; we insult Him.

Perhaps, at this present time, the Holy Spirit is trying to bring to the mind of the reader of these lines some truth that

the reader is unwilling to accept and you are refusing to listen. Perhaps you are treating that truth, which in the bottom of your heart you know to be true, with contempt, speaking scornfully of it. If so, you are not merely treating abstract truth with contempt, you are scorning and insulting a Person, a divine Person.

LYING TO THE HOLY SPIRIT.

In Acts 5:3, we read, "But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land?" Here we are taught that the Holy Spirit can be lied to. You cannot tell lies to a blind, impersonal influence or power, only to a person. Not every lie is a lie to the Holy Spirit. It was a peculiar kind of lie that Ananias told. From the context we see that Ananias was making a profession of an entire consecration of everything. (See ch. 4:36 to 5:11.) As Barnabas had laid all at the apostles' feet for the use of Christ and His cause, so Ananias pretended to do the same, but in reality he kept back part; the pretended full consecration was only partial. Real consecration is under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. The profession of full consecration was to Him and the profession was false. Ananias lied to the Holy Spirit. How often in our consecration meetings today we profess a full consecration, when in reality there is something that we have held back. In doing this, we lie to the Holy Spirit.

BLASPHEMY AGAINST THE HOLY SPIRIT.

In Matt. 12:31, 32, we read, "Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." Here we are

told that the Holy Spirit may be blasphemed. It is impossible to blaspheme an influence or power; only a Person can be blasphemed. We are still further told that the blasphemy of the Holy Spirit is a more serious and decisive sin than even the blasphemy of the Son of Man Himself. Could anything make more clear that the Holy Spirit is a person and a divine person?

SUMMARY.

To sum it all up, THE HOLY SPIRIT IS A PERSON. The Scriptures make this plain beyond a question to any one who candidly goes to the Scriptures to find out what they really teach. Theoretically, most of us believe this, but do we in our real thought of Him, in our practical attitude toward Him, treat Him as a Person? Do we regard Him as indeed as real a Person as Jesus Christ, as loving, as wise, as strong, as worthy of our confidence and love and surrender as He? The Holy Spirit came into this world to be to the disciples and to us what Jesus Christ had been to them during the days of His personal companionship with them. (John 14:16, 17.) Is He that to us? Do we walk in conscious fellowship with Him? Do we realize that He walks by our side every day and hour? Yes, and better than that, that He dwells in our hearts and is ready to fill them and take complete possession of our lives? Do we know the "communion of the Holy Ghost?" (2 Cor. 13:14.) Communion means fellowship, partnership, comradeship. Do we know this personal fellowship, this partnership, this comradeship, this intimate friendship of the Holy Spirit? Herein lies the secret of a real Christian life, a life of liberty and joy and power and fullness. To have as one's ever-present Friend, and to be conscious that one has as his ever-present Friend, the Holy Spirit, and to surrender one's life in all its departments entirely to His control, this is true Christian living.

CHAPTER XVI

THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE SONS OF GOD

BY REV. W. J. ERDMAN, D. D.,
GERMANTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA

It is evident from many tracts and treatises on the Baptism of the Holy Spirit that due importance has not been given to the *peculiar characteristic* of the Pentecost gift in its relation to *the sonship of believers.*

Before considering this theme a few brief statements may be made concerning the personality and deity of the Holy Spirit and His relation to the people of God in the dispensations and times preceding the Day of Pentecost.

1. *The Holy Spirit, the Comforter, another Person, but not a different Being.*

In general it may be said, He is not an "influence" or a sum and series of "influences," but a personal Being with names and affections, words and acts, interchanged with those of God.

He is God as Creator. (Gen. 1:2; Psa. 104:30; Job 26:13; Luke 1:35.) He is one with God as Jehovah (Lord) in providential leading and care, and susceptible of grief on account of the unholiness of His chosen people. We cannot grieve an "influence," but only a person, and a person, too, who *loves us.* (Psa. 78:40; Eph. 4:30.) He is one with God as Adonai (Lord), whose glory Isaiah beheld and John rehearses, who commissioned the prophet and sent forth the apostle. (Isa. 6:1-10; John 12:37-41; Acts 13:2; 20:15-18.) In these Scriptures one and the same act is that of Jehovah and of Jesus and of the Holy Spirit.

Besides the clear evidence of personality and equality in the baptismal words and in the benediction (Matt. 28:19;

2 Cor. 13:14), the promise of Jesus affirms the presence and the abiding of the Spirit to be one with His own and with the Father's in this Word. "If a man love Me he will keep My words, and My Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him" (John 16:23). Above all, the name "another Comforter" (Paraclete) suggests a Person who would do for the disciples what Jesus the other Comforter (Luke 2:25) had been doing for them. He speaks, testifies, teaches, reminds, reproves, convicts, warns, commands, loves, consoles, beseeches, prays, intercedes, (often the word is "paracletes"); in brief, all these and other acts and dealings are not those of an impersonal medium or influence, but of a person, and One who in the nature of the case cannot be less than God in wisdom, love and power, and who is one with the Father and the Son; *another Person indeed, but not a different Being.*

2. *The spiritual, Divine life in the people of God is the same in kind in every age and dispensation,* but *the relation* to God in which *the life was developed of old* was *different* from that which now exists between believers as sons and God as Father, and in accordance with that relationship the Holy Spirit acted.

He was of old the Author and Nourisher of all spiritual life and power in righteous men and women of past ages, in patriarch and friend of God, in Israelites as minors and servants, in pious kings and adoring psalmists, in consecrated priests and faithful prophets; and whatever truth had been revealed, He employed to develop the Divine life He had imparted. From the beginning, He used promise and precept, law and type, Psalm and ritual to instruct, quicken, convince, teach, lead, warn, comfort and to do all for the growth and establishment of the people of God.

The Psalms run through the gamut of the spiritual experience possible for those, who while waiting for the consolation of Israel and the future out-pouring of the Holy Spirit, were

"apart from us" not to be "made perfect" as sons and as "worshipers." More than one prayed, "Teach me to do Thy will, for Thou art my God; let Thy good Spirit lead me into the land of uprightness" (Psa. 143:10). But there was then still lacking among men the consummate Reality and perfect Illustration of a Son of God.

When at last, all righteousness and holy virtues appeared in a Life of filial love and obedience, even in Christ "the first-born of many brethren," then the Mold and Image of the spiritual life of the saints of the old covenant, who were waiting for sonship, was seen perfect and complete.

It was pre-eminently the life of a Son of God and not only of a righteous man; of a Son ever rejoicing before the Father, His whole being filled with filial love and obedience, peace and joy. In ways Godward and manward, in self-denial and in full surrender to His Father's will, in hatred of sin and in grace to sinners, in purity of heart and forgiveness of injuries, in gentleness and all condescension, in restful yet ceaseless service, in unity of purpose and faultless obedience—in a word, in all excellencies and graces, in all virtues and beauties of the Spirit, in light and in love, the Lord Jesus set forth the mold and substance of the life spiritual, divine, eternal.

3. *Redemption must precede both the sonship and the gift of the Spirit.*

This is very clearly seen in the Apostle's argument on the great subject: "God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the law, that He might redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father" (Gal. 4:4-6). The word "adoption" signifies the placing in the state and relation of a son. It is found in Romans 9:4; 13:15, 23; Gal. 4:5; Eph. 1:5.

In the writings of John believers are never called sons, but "children" ("born ones"), a word indicating nature, kinship.

Sonship relates not to nature, but to legal standing; it comes not through regeneration, but by redemption. The disciples of Jesus had to wait until the Son of God had redeemed them; and then on the redeemed disciples the Spirit of God was poured at Pentecost, not to make believers sons, but because they had become sons through redemption. In brief, sonship, though ever since redemption inseparable from justification, does in the order of salvation succeed justification. Justification in Rom. 5:1 precedes the "grace" of sonship in 5:2. This "access" or "introduction" is of the justified into the presence of God as Father; and it is through Christ and by the Spirit. (Eph. 2:18; 3:12.)

We were "predestined" to be sons of God, and to be "conformed to the image of His Son" (Eph. 1:5; Rom. 8:29). In Eph. 1:5 the "sonship" is rather corporate; all believers are viewed as one "son," one "body," just as Jehovah said of Israel, "My son," "My first born." This corporateness is really to be understood in Gal. 3:28, which may read, "Ye are all one son in Christ Jesus," instead of "one man." (See also Eph. 4:13; 1 Cor. 12:12.)

And this image is His as glorified, so that until we have been conformed to His body of glory, our "adoption" or sonship is not complete nor our experience of redemption finished. (Rom. 8:23.)

And special emphasis should be laid upon the truth that sins were before God only *preternitted* until the atonement was made; "propitiation for the pretermission [passing over] of sins that are past" (Rom. 3:25); "for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament" (Heb. 9:15).

Remission came through the great offering for sin, just as sonship came through this redemption; and as the Spirit was given because believers had become sons, so also He could be given because believers had received the remission of their

sins. This is the invariable order; faith in Christ, remission of sins, gift of the Holy Spirit.

Yea, more, as without the gracious power of the Spirit of God *the new birth* would be impossible, so without the redeeming blood of Christ the estate of sonship would have been unattainable; the Spirit and the blood are equally necessary to the full accomplishment of the eternal purpose of God.

In brief, through redemption the new dignity of sonship was conferred, the new name "sons" was given to them as a new name "Father" had been declared of Him; a new name was given to the life in this new relation, "the life eternal," and a new name, "Spirit of His Son," was given to the Holy Spirit, who henceforth, with new truth and a new commandment, would nourish and develop this life and illumine and lead believers into all the privileges and duties of the sons of God.

These facts are then all related to and dependent upon each other; Jesus must first lay the ground of the forgiveness of sins of past and future times in His work of redemption and reconciliation; as risen and glorified, not before, He is "the first-born of many brethren," to whose image they are predestined to be conformed; as the Son, He declared to them the name of God as Father, the crowning name of God corresponding to their highest name, sons of God. As His "brethren" in this high and peculiar sense, He did not call them until He had first suffered, died, and risen again from the dead, but that name is the first word He spoke of them on the morning of resurrection, as if it were the chiefest joy of His soul to name and greet them as His brethren, and sons of God, being in and with Him "sons of the resurrection;" and because they were sons, the Father, through the Son, sent forth the Spirit of His Son into their hearts, crying, "Abba, Father!"

It is the marvelous dignity of a sonship in glory, like that of our Lord Jesus, with all its attendant blessings and priv-

ileges, service and rewards, suffering and glories, to which the gift of the Holy Spirit is related in this present dispensation.

Accordingly when the disciples were baptized with the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost they were not only endued with ministering power, but they also then entered into the experience of sonship. Then they knew as they could not have known before, though the Book of the Acts records but little of their inner life, that through the heaven-descended Spirit the sons of God are forever united with the heaven-ascended, glorified Son of God. Whether they at first fully realized this fact or not, it is seen as in the Gospel of John, they were in Him and He in them. Was Jesus begotten of the Spirit, so were they; was He not of the world as to origin and nature, neither were they; was He loved of the Father, so were they, and with the same love; was He sanctified and sent into the world to bear witness to the truth, so likewise He sent them; did He receive the Spirit as the seal of God to His Sonship, so were they sealed; was He anointed with power and light to serve, so they received the unction from Him; did He begin to serve when there came the attesting Spirit and confirming word of the Father, so they began to serve when the Spirit of the Son, the Witness, was sent forth into their hearts, saying Abba, Father; was He, after service and suffering, received up in glory, so shall they obtain His glory when He comes again to receive them unto Himself. Verily, "we are as He is in this world." (1 John 4:17; John 10:36; 17:1-26; Rom. 5:5.)

In view of these truths of Divine revelation how foolish the wisdom of the natural man and how sadly misleading the doctrine which makes the "fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man," which are by nature and creation, identical and co-extensive with that which is by grace and redemption; for not only does the imperative word, "Ye must be born again," sweep away all the merit and glory of man

as he is by the first birth, but also, the predestination to a sonship like that of the Son of God in glory lifts the "twice-born" to a height and dignity never conceived of by the natural man.

4. In the *gift of the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost all gifts* for believers in Christ were contained and were *related* to them as *Sons of God* both individually and corporatively as the Church the Body of Christ.

In kind, as can be seen on comparison, there was no difference in His gifts and acts before and after that day, but the new Gift was now to dwell in the hearts of men as sons of God and with more abundant life and varied manifestations of power and wisdom.

But by the Spirit the one Body was formed and all gifts are due to His perpetual presence. (1 Cor. 12:14.) Also, it is to be understood that such a word of Jesus, "If ye then being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him," could not have been fulfilled until a later hour, for repeating His promise at another time it is said of Jesus, "But this spake He of the Spirit which they that believed on Him should receive, for the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified" (John 3:7-39). These are some of the *anticipative sayings* of our Lord, not to be made good until He had died and risen again. The good things could not be given until "transgression had been forgiven and sin covered." The water could not pour forth until the Rock had been smitten. And as to the use of the words, "baptize" and "pour," they afterwards, in later Scriptures, imply the original incorporating act.

It is significant that after Pentecost only the words, "filled with the Spirit," are used. Nothing is said of an individual receiving a new or fresh "baptism of the Spirit." It would imply that the baptism is one for the whole Body until all the members are incorporated; one the outpouring, many the

fillings; one fountain, many the hearts to drink, to have in turn a well of water springing up within them.

The disciples were indeed endued with power for service according to promise; on *that* especially their eyes and hearts had been fixed; that was the chief thing for them; but in the light of later Scriptures it is seen that the chief thing with God was not only to attest the glory of Jesus by the gift of the Spirit, but also *"in one Spirit to baptize into one body"* the "children of God," who until then were looked upon as "scattered abroad," as unincorporated members. (1 Cor. 12:13; John 11:52; Gal. 3:27, 28.) And the Gift, whether to the Body or to the individual member, is once for all. As the Christian is once for all in Christ, so the Holy Spirit is once for all in the Christian; but the intent of the presence of the Spirit is often but feebly met by the believer, just as his knowledge of what it is to be "in Christ" is often most defective.

5. *The Holy Spirit is given at once on the remission of sins* to them that believe in Christ Jesus as their Lord and Saviour.

It is, however, to be observed that as the Spirit acts according to the truth known, or believed and obeyed, *an interval* unspiritual or unfruitful *may come* between the remission of sins and the *marked manifestation* of the Spirit, either in relation to holiness of life, or to power for service, or to patience in trials. It certainly is the divine ideal of a holy life, that the presence of the Spirit should at once be *made manifest* on the forgiveness of sins, and continue in increasing light and power to the end. (Rom. 5:1-5; Titus 3:4-7.)

And this steady onward progress more and more unto the perfect day has been and is true of many, who from early childhood, or from the day of conversion, in the case of adults, were led continuously by the Spirit and never came to one great crisis. With others it is not so, for it is the confession of a large number of men and women, afterward eminent for holiness, devotion, endurance, that their life previous to such

crisis had been hardly worth the name of Christian. Whatever explanation or "philosophy" of such experience may be given, the following is true of the majority.

The full truth of the sonship and salvation of believers may not have been taught them when they first believed; the life may have begun under a yoke of legal bondage; the freedom of filial access may have been doubted, even though their hearts often burned within them because of the presence of the unknown Spirit; and thus weary, ineffective years passed, attended with but little growth in grace or fruitful service, or patient resignation, until a point was reached in various ways, and through providences often unexpected and most marvelous, when at last the Holy Spirit made Himself manifest in the fulness of His love and power.

That there is *with God* an interval between justification and the giving of the Spirit (an interval such as certain theories contend for), cannot be proved. The unsatisfactory experience of the ignorant Christian may lead him to think he never had the Spirit.

There are, however, certain intervals recorded in the New Testament which should be considered. The one between the ascension and Pentecost was for a peculiar preparation through prayer and waiting on the Lord; that of the forty days between the resurrection and the ascension was a continuation of the presence of Jesus the other Comforter, and of whom it is written, "He opened their understanding that they understand the Scriptures," so doing what His Holy Spirit was to do when He came; and during the previous days of His public ministry not only did Jesus teach, but as attested at the confession of Peter, also the Father was revealing truth to men: "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father who is in heaven."

In the light of this word to Peter it may be said that up to Pentecost the Spirit of God was at work in the world in the modes of the old dispensation, but that when the Day of

Pentecost came His peculiar work began in relation to believers as sons of God. Even the breathing of Christ upon the disciples on the evening of the day of His resurrection was, in accordance with the many symbolic acts and sayings recorded in the Gospel of John, symbolic of the Mighty Breath of Pentecost, for both the symbol and the reality were associated with the enduement of power for the service which began at Pentecost. Besides, they were told forty days later to tarry in Jerusalem for such enduement. They could not already have received it and yet be told to wait for it. And Thomas was not present on the evening of that breathing.

As to other intervals; that in case of the converts on the Day of Pentecost was doubtless for the confirmation of the apostolic authority; that of the Samaritans when Philip preached may be accounted for by remembering the religious feud between Jew and Samaritan which now must be settled for all time and the unity of the Church established. Also seeing "salvation is from the Jews," the authority of Jewish apostles must be affirmed, for to them Christ had committed the founding of the Church. (Acts 8: 14-17.)

In regard to Paul, it is evident from the narrative, he knew not the full import of the appearing of Jesus, until Ananias came. The recovery of sight, the forgiveness of sins, the filling of the Holy Spirit, all took place during this interview. He received the Spirit, as was befitting the Apostle to the Gentiles, in a Gentile city, far away from the other apostles, for his apostleship was to be "not from men, neither through a man" (Acts 9: 10-19; 22: 6-16).

But the case of Cornelius proves that *no interval at all need exist,* for the moment Peter spoke this word, received by faith by Cornelius and those present, the Holy Spirit who knew their hearts fell on them: "To Him give all the prophets witness that through His name whosoever believeth in Him shall receive *the remission of sins.*" Peter intended to say more, but God showed by the sudden outpouring of the Spirit

that Peter had said enough, for from Peter's report to the church in Jerusalem we learn that he intended to say more, and not only say more but probably do more, so making an interval even as in the case of the Samaritans through baptism, prayer and laying on of his hands that they might receive the Holy Ghost. (Acts 8:14-17; 10:43-44; 11:15, 16.)

It is especially to be noted in this connection that the text of Eph. 1:13, so often quoted as proving a long interval between faith in Christ and "the sealing of the Spirit," "In whom also *after* that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise," lends no authority for such long interval of time, for the word "after" implies more than the Greek participle warrants, and accordingly the Revision reads, "In whom having also believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise;" *but the very same participle,* "having believed," used by Paul in Ephesians, is used by Peter in the Acts in rehearsing the interview with Cornelius, who received the Spirit *immediately.* (Acts 2:17.)

Neither does the remaining instance of the twelve disciples of John the Baptist whom Paul found in Ephesus, prove that such an interval is necessary or inevitable today; for they had not even heard that Jesus had come, and that redemption had been accomplished, and the Spirit given; but as soon as remission of sins in the name of Jesus was preached to them, they believed, were baptized, and through prayer and the laying on of Paul's hands, received the Holy Spirit. (Acts 19:1-6.)

The question Paul addressed to them, "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?" (or in the Revision, "Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed?") has been most strangely applied in these days to Christians, whereas it was pertinent to these disciples of John only. *To address it to Christians now is to deny a finished redemption, the sonship of believers and the once-for-all out-pouring of the Holy Spirit.*

And it is implied in the case of Cornelius* with which the Apostle Peter had nothing to do except to preach the word, that when the apostles had passed away *the mold of experience* common for all succeeding centuries would be *that of these Gentile converts* wherever in Christendom or heathendom the Gospel of Christ might be preached.

6. The *conditions of the manifestation* of the presence and power of the Spirit are *the same,* at conversion or at any later, deeper experience of the believer, whether in relation to fuller knowledge of Christ, or to more effective service, or to more patient endurance of ill, or to growth in likeness to Christ.

The experience, in each case, is run in the same mold; *each part, each word or fact of Christ, must be received in the same attitude and condition of mind as the first,* when He was seen as the Bearer of our sins, even *by faith alone.*

Negatively, it may be said that the conditions are confessed weakness and inability to help oneself; the end of nature's wisdom, power, righteousness has been reached; utter despair of there being any good thing *"in the flesh"* settles over the soul, a willingness to look to God alone for help begins to stir in the heart. Convictions of unfaithfulness and self-seeking mingle with a hunger and thirst for righteousness and a life worthy of the name of Christian.

It is not, however, as consciously sinless in themselves that the Spirit is given to them who "seek the blessing," but to them as sinless "in Christ." Believers in Christ begin their life in the very standing of the Son of God Himself. Neither do the Scriptures teach, as implied or expressed in certain theories, that there is an interval between the remission of sins and "the sealing of the Spirit," and that "justified" believers may die during such interval having never been "sealed," and so never been "in Christ," and never been attested sons of God.

*Acts 10.

Such belief contradicts the very grace of God and implies that sonship depends upon the gift of the Spirit and not upon redemption and the remission of sins, and would read, "Because ye have the Spirit ye are sons," instead of, "And because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." It also follows that such justified ones devoid of the Spirit are not Christ's nor Christians, for it is plainly written, "But if any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His;" and also, "No man can say, Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit." And as to the proof of the presence of the Spirit at such times, whatever emotions or high raptures may attend the discoveries of the love and power of God in the case of some, they are not to be the tests and measures for all. Conversions are not alike in all, neither are the manifestations of the Spirit. He may come like the sun at high noon through rifted clouds or like a slowly deepening dawn; like a shower or like the dew; like a great tide of air or like a gentle breathing; but "all these worketh the one and self-same Spirit." But more than all, the proof is seen in growth in holiness, in self-denials for Christ's sake, in the manifold graces and abiding fruit of the Spirit.

As in the apostolic day so now the desire exists for the manifestation of the Spirit in marvelous ways; but a life sober, righteous, holy, lived in the hope of the glory to come, is the more excellent way of the Spirit's manifestation and undeniable proof of His indwelling.

Positively, the requirements or inseparable accompaniments of the manifestation of the indwelling Spirit, whether for holy living or faithful service, must be drawn from the example of the Son of God our Lord Jesus. And they are *prayer, obedience, faith,* and above all *a desire and purpose to glorify Christ.* All, indeed, may be summed up in one condition, and that is, *to let God have His own will and way with us.*

If, then, it is to believers as sons of God, to whom and in whom and through whom the Holy Spirit manifests His presence and power, it would follow that whatever Jesus did in order to fulfil His mission in the power of the Spirit, believers must do; and we find His life to have been a life of *prayer* for all the gifts and helps of God, a life of *obedience,* always doing the things that pleased the Father; and so, never left alone, a life of *faith* in the present power of God, a life of *devotion* to the glory of God, so that at its close He, through the eternal Spirit, offered Himself without blemish unto God.

But the chief and all-including condition and proof is the desire and purpose to glorify Christ.

The prayer should not be so much for this or that gift, or this or that result, as for Christ Himself to be made manifest to us and through us. The Apostle who was most filled with the Spirit sums all up in that one great word, "For me to live is Christ." As Jesus the Son of God glorified the Father, so the sons of God are to glorify Christ.

The Spirit cannot be where Christ is denied as Redeemer, Life and Lord of all. Christ is "the Truth," and the Spirit is "the Spirit of the Truth;" all is personal, not ideal, for the sum and substance of material wherewith the Spirit works is Christ. The Spirit cannot be teaching if Christ is not seen in "the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms," as well as in the Gospels, or if Christ is not acknowledged to have continued "to do and to teach" in the Acts and in the Epistles what He began in the Gospels.

If Christ is indeed the wisdom of God unto salvation, the Holy Spirit alone can demonstrate it unto the minds and hearts of men; and He has *no mission* in the world separable from Christ and His work of redemption. The outer work of Christ and the inner work of the Spirit go together. The work *for* us by Christ is through the *blood,* the work *in* us by the Spirit is through the *truth;* the latter rests upon the former; and without the Spirit, substitutes for the Spirit and

His work will be accompanied by substitutes for Christ and His work. The importance, therefore, of the presence and work of the Holy Spirit should be estimated according to that far-reaching and all-touching word of Christ, "He shall glorify Me" (John 16:13-15).

To glorify Christ is to manifest Him as supremely excellent; to blind the eyes of men to that glory is the purpose of the god of this world; therefore, which spirit is at work in a man or in a church can easily be told.

7. In conclusion, the sum of all *His mission is to perfect in saints the good work He began, and He molds it all according to this reality of a high and holy sonship:* He establishes the saints in and for Christ. (2 Cor. 1:21.) According to this reality their life and walk partake of thoughts and desires, hopes and objects, unworldly and heavenly. Born of God and from above, knowing whence they came and whither they are going, they live and move and have their being in a world not realized by flesh and blood.

Their life is hid with Christ in God; their work of faith is wrought out in the unseen abode of the Spirit; their labor of love is prompted by a loyal obedience to their Lord, who is absent in "a far country" to which both He and they belong; their sufferings are not their own but His, who, from out of the Glory could ask, "Why persecutest thou Me?" Their worship is of the Father "in spirit and in truth" before the mercy seat, "in the light which no man can approach unto;" their peace is "the peace of God," which can never be disturbed by any fear or trouble which eternal ages might disclose; their joy is "joy in the Lord," its spring is in God and ever deepening in its perpetual flow; their hope is the coming of the Son of God from heaven and the vision of the King in His beauty amidst the unspeakable splendors of His Father's house; and through all the way, "thorn and flower," by which they are journeying to the heavenly country; it is the good Spirit who is leading them. (Isa. 63:7-14.)

CHAPTER XVII

OBSERVATIONS ON THE CONVERSION AND APOSTLESHIP OF ST. PAUL

BY LORD LYTTELTON

ANALYZED AND CONDENSED BY REV. J. L. CAMPBELL, D. D., CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

The object of this paper is to present in an abbreviated form the famous argument of Lord Lyttelton in defense of Christianity based on the conversion of the Apostle Paul. A few words about the man himself and about the interesting circumstances in which this treatise was written will properly introduce the subject.

George Lyttelton was born at Hagley, Worcestershire, England, January 17, 1709, and died on Tuesday morning, August 22, 1773, aged sixty-four years. He belonged to a distinguished "family of long descent and gentle blood, dwelling for centuries on the same spot." Educated at Eton and Oxford, he soon afterwards entered Parliament, "and for many years the name of George Lyttelton was seen in every account of every debate in the House of Commons." From this, he advanced successively to the position of lord commissioner of the treasury, and of chancellor of the exchequer, after which he was raised to the peerage. He was also a man of letters and his closing years were devoted almost wholly to literary pursuits. He was a writer of verse as well as prose and Dr. Samuel Johnson has furnished us with his biography in his "Lives of the Poets." Outside of his books, which comprise nine octavo volumes, his Memoirs and Correspondence make two additional volumes that were compiled and edited by Robert Phillimore in 1845.

The eighteenth century was the darkest period religiously in the history of England since the time of the Reformation. It was the age of the great deists, agnostics, rationalists and unbelievers, when "all men of rank are [were] thought to be infidels." Like so many of the literary men of his time, George Lyttelton and his friend Gilbert West were led at first to reject the Christian religion. On the Sabbath forenoon before he died, in an interview with Dr. Johnson, Lyttelton said, "When I first set out in the world I had friends who endeavored to shake my belief in the Christian religion. I saw difficulties which staggered me," etc. In his biography of Lord Lyttelton, Dr. Johnson adds, "He had, in the pride of juvenile confidence, with the help of corrupt conversation, entertained doubts of the truth of Christianity." His intimacy with Bolingbroke, Chesterfield, Pope and others of the same kind had no doubt influenced him in this direction. Rev. T. T. Biddolph tells us that both Lyttelton and West, "men of acknowledged talents, had imbibed the principles of infidelity. * * * Fully persuaded that the Bible was an imposture, they were determined to expose the cheat. Lord Lyttelton chose the Conversion of Paul and Mr. West the Resurrection of Christ for the subject of hostile criticism. Both sat down to their respective tasks full of prejudice; but the result of their separate attempts was, that they were both converted by their efforts to overthrow the truth of Christianity. They came together, not as they expected, to exult over an imposture exposed to ridicule, but to lament over their own folly and to felicitate each other on their joint conviction that the Bible was the word of God. Their able inquiries have furnished two of the most valuable treatises in favor of revelation, one entitled 'Observations on the Conversion of St. Paul' and the other 'Observations on the Resurrection of Christ.'" West's book was the first published. Lyttelton's work appeared at first anonymously in 1747, when he was thirty-eight years of age. The edition which lies before me contains seventy-eight

compact pages. It is addressed in the form of a letter to Gilbert West. In the opening paragraph he says, "The conversion and apostleship of St. Paul alone, duly considered, was of itself a demonstration sufficient to prove Christianity to be a divine revelation." Dr. Johnson remarked that it is a treatise "to which infidelity had never been able to fabricate a specious answer." Dr. Philip Doddridge, who became Lyttelton's most intimate religious friend, speaks of it as "masterly," and, "as perfect in its kind as any our age has produced." Testimonials of this kind might be multiplied indefinitely.

Let us now turn to an examination of the book itself. Lyttelton naturally begins by bringing before us all the facts that we have in the New Testament regarding the conversion of St. Paul; the three accounts given in the Acts; what we have in Galatians, Philippians, Timothy, Corinthians, Colossians and in other places. (Acts 9:22-26; Gal. 1:11-16; Phil. 3:4-8; 1 Tim. 1:12, 13; 1 Cor. 15:8; 2 Cor. 1:1; Col. 1:1, etc.) Then he lays down four propositions which he considers exhaust all the possibilities in the case.

1. Either Paul was "an impostor who said what he knew to be false, with an intent to deceive;" or

2. He was an enthusiast who imposed on himself by the force of "an overheated imagination;" or

3. He was "deceived by the fraud of others;" or, finally,

4. What he declared to be the cause of his conversion did all really happen; "and, therefore the Christian religion is a divine revelation."

I. PAUL NOT AN IMPOSTOR

More than half his argument (about forty pages) is devoted to the first of these propositions, which is really the key to the whole situation. Is this story of Paul's conversion so often repeated in Acts and Epistles a fabrication, put forth by a designing man with the deliberate purpose and intention of deceiving?

Lyttelton at once raises the question of motive. What could have induced him while on his way to Damascus, filled with implacable hatred against this whole sect, to turn around and become a disciple of Christ?

1. Was it wealth?

No, all the wealth was in the keeping of those whom he had forsaken; the poverty was on the side of those with whom he now identified himself. So poor had they been, that those among them possessed of any little property sold whatever belonged to them in order to provide for the dire necessities of the rest. Indeed, one of the burdens afterwards laid upon Paul was to collect means for those who were threatened with starvation. Such was the humble condition of these early Christians, that he often refused to take anything from them even for the bare necessities of life, but labored himself to provide for his scanty needs. To the Corinthians, he writes, "Even unto this present hour we both hunger, and thirst, and are naked, and are buffeted, and have no certain dwelling place; and we toil working with our hands." (1 Cor. 4:11, 12. See also 2 Cor. 12:14; 1 Thess. 2:4-9; 2 Thess. 3:8, etc.) In his farewell to the elders of Ephesus, he appeals to them as knowing it to be true that, "I coveted no man's silver or gold or apparel. Ye yourselves know that these hands ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me" (Acts 20:33, 34). He forsook the great Jewish hierarchy with its gorgeous temple and its overflowing treasuries, where his zeal in putting down the hated sect of the Nazarene would have been almost certainly rewarded with a fortune. He cast in his lot among the poverty-stricken disciples of Jesus Christ, among whom it was his ambition to be poor. Near the end of his life he presents to us the picture of an old man shivering in a Roman dungeon and pathetically asking for a cloak to be sent him to cover his naked and suffering limbs during the severity of an Italian winter.

2. Was it reputation?

No; those with whom he united were held in universal contempt; their Leader had been put to death as a criminal among thieves; the chiefs of the cause that he had espoused were illiterate men. On the other hand, the wisest and the greatest men in all the land indignantly rejected the teachings of this new sect. The preaching of Christ crucified was to the Jew a stumbling block and to the Greeks foolishness. There was no reputation for the great disciple of Gamaliel in parting with his splendid honors and identifying himself with a lot of ignorant fishermen. He would only be execrated as a deserter and betrayer of the Jewish cause, and he might rest assured that the same bloody knife that slew the Shepherd of the scattered flock would soon be unsheathed against himself. All the reputation that he had so zealously built up was gone the hour that he went over to the new religion, and from that day on contempt was his portion. He was accounted as the filth of the world and the offscouring of all things. (1 Cor. 4:13.)

3. Was it power he was after?

We know what men have done to get into positions of prominence and dominion over their fellows. Mahomet, the popes, and many others, put forth spiritual claims so as to promote thereby their own temporal ends. How was it with Paul? His whole career was marked by a complete absence of all self-seeking. He had no eye to worldly ambitions. He interfered with nothing, "in government or civil affairs; he meddled not with legislation; he formed no commonwealths; he raised no seditions; he affected no temporal power." He assumed no pre-eminence over other Christians. He regarded himself as not worthy to be called an apostle, as less than the least of all saints, as the chief of sinners. Those engaged in like work he called "fellow-laborers" and "fellow-servants." Even if the truth was spread by those hostile to him, through "envy and strife," so long as Christ was proclaimed, "therein

I rejoice, yea, and will rejoice" (Phil. 1:18). He did not lord it over the churches, even over those that he himself had founded. To the Pauline party in Corinth he exclaims, "Was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?" (1 Cor. 1:13). "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus as Lord, and ourselves as *your servants* for Jesus' sake" (2 Cor. 4:5). Those who, from selfish motives seek for influence over people pander to them and flatter them [as, e. g. did Absalom]. There was nothing of this with Paul. He rebuked the churches unsparingly for their sins, and did not hesitate, if need be, to incur their displeasure. Disclaiming all pre-eminence and position and power, he preached Christ and Him crucified as the head, and hid and buried self behind the cross. Earth to him was nothing. His eye was fixed on "the recompense of reward" (Heb. 11:26).

4. Was his motive the gratification of any other passion?

Impostors have pretended to receive divine revelations as a pretext in order that they might indulge in loose conduct. Was it so here? No; for all Paul's teachings were in the most absolute antagonism to any such purpose. "His writings breathe nothing but the strictest morality, obedience to magistrates, order, and government, with the utmost abhorrence of all licentiousness, idleness, or loose behavior under the cloak of religion." Writing to the Thessalonians, he utters the challenge, "Ye are witnesses, and God also, how holily and righteously and unblameably we behaved ourselves toward you that believe" (1 Thess. 2:10). "We wronged no man, we corrupted no man, we took advantage of no man" (2 Cor. 7:2). The whole teaching of the Apostle is in the sternest and most uncompromising hostility to everything but the highest and holiest ideals.

5. Was it a pious fraud?

That is to say, did Paul pretend to receive a divine revelation in order to give him prestige in advancing the teachings of Christianity? But Christianity was the one thing he had

set out to destroy. To become a Christian was to incur the hatred, the contempt, the torments and the violent deaths suffered by Christians in that day. Why then this sudden change in Paul's own views regarding the unpopular teachings of the Nazarene? Would he have endured "the loss of all things" and exulted over it, for what he knew was a fraud? Would he have spent a life of the most arduous toil to induce others to make every earthly sacrifice while he knew that behind it all he was practising a delusion? It would be an imposture as unprofitable as it was perilous, both to himself the deceiver and to the others whom he deceived. The theory confutes itself. Only the sternest conviction that he had received a divine revelation could have induced Paul to pass through what he himself had suffered, or to have asked others to do the same. "If we have only hoped in Christ in this life, we are of all men most pitiable" (1 Cor. 15:19).

But had he practiced a deception, he could not have successfully carried it out. Men sometimes act capriciously. Suppose that Paul "just did it" without any motive that can be imagined; then he must have ignominiously failed in his attempt to perpetuate such a fraud. How could he, e. g., have become such an adept in the mysteries and secrets of the new religion as to be an authority and an apostle of it, if he had to depend for his special knowledge on information received from men who knew well by bitter experience that he was their capital enemy? It must have come in another way, and his own account makes it plain. "For neither did I receive it [the Gospel] from man, nor was I taught it, but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ" (Gal. 1:12). Had he fabricated the story of his conversion he would certainly have located it in a place so remote or hidden that there could be no witnesses to refute. [Joe Smith, e. g., and the golden plates of the Book of Mormon.] Instead of that the miracle of Paul's conversion, with its great light from heaven exceeding the brightness of the sun, is placed in the public highway

near Damascus; at noonday, when their senses could not be deceived, and when all the accompanying soldiers and commissioners were with him on the spot. Had there been a shadow of disproof, how promptly the Jews in Damascus would have nipped the falsehood in the bud by the testimony of the witnesses who were present with Paul at the time. Or, when the Apostle stood on the castle stairs in Jerusalem and told the whole story, why did not the Jewish authorities silence him at once and forever by showing that nothing of the kind had ever taken place, and proved it by the abundant evidence of the competent witnesses who were with him—if it were not true? It was an event that took place before the eyes of the world, and would be made at once a matter of the strictest scrutiny. And the truth of the fact was so incontestably established that it had become a matter of common knowledge. The Jews said the utmost they could against Paul before the Roman court, and yet Paul appealed directly to King Agrippa in presence of Festus as to his own personal knowledge of the truth of the story. "For the king knoweth of these things, unto whom also I speak freely; for I am persuaded that none of these things is hidden from him; for this hath not been done in a corner" (Acts 26:26)—"a very remarkable proof both of the notoriety of the fact, and the integrity of the man, who, with so fearless a confidence, could call upon a *king* to give testimony for him, even while he was sitting in judgment upon him." Moreover, how came it that Ananias went to meet such an enemy in Damascus, if the story of his conversion was made up? If Paul was an impostor, then all his miracles were simply tricks or sleight-of-hand. Nevertheless, he, a despised and hated Jew, set himself to the appalling task of converting the Gentile world—teaching doctrines that shocked every prejudice and at which they were wont to mock in derision. Arrayed against him were the magistrates with their policy and power, the priests with their interests and craft, the people with their prejudice and passions, the philosophers with their pride and

wisdom. Could he by feats of jugglery in presence of a shrewd, hostile people strike Elymas the sorcerer, blind; heal a cripple at Lystra; restore the pythoness at Philippi; shake open with a prayer the doors of a prison; raise the dead to life, etc., so that thousands were converted and great pure churches renouncing all sin and dishonesty, established throughout the Roman world? Our author shows that this would be impossible without divine help and therefore he concludes that he has proven (1) that Paul was not a cheat telling a trumped-up story about his conversion, and (2) if he were, he could not have succeeded.

II. PAUL NOT AN ENTHUSIAST WHO IMPOSED ON HIMSELF

This second argument covers twenty pages. Was Paul a deluded enthusiast whose overheated imagination imposed on him so that he imagined to be true that which had never really taken place? Lord Lyttelton makes an analysis of the elements that enter into the make-up of a man of this type. He finds these to be five.

(*1*) *Great heat of temper.*

While Paul had intense fervor, like all great men, yet it was everywhere governed by discretion and reason. His zeal was his servant, not the master of his judgment. He possessed consummate tact which proves self-control. In indifferent matters he became "all things to all men;" to the Jews he became a Jew, to them that are without law as without law, to the weak he became weak—all, that he might gain some. (1 Cor. 9:19-23.) "His zeal was eager and warm, but tempered with prudence, and even with the civilities and decorums of life, as appears by his behavior to Agrippa, Festus and Felix; not the blind, inconsiderate, indecent zeal of an enthusiast."

(*2*) *Melancholy.*

He regards this as a prominent mark of misguided zeal. He finds nothing of it in Paul. There is great sorrow over his

former ignorant persecution of the church, but there are no gloomy self-imposed penances such as melancholy fanatics inflict upon themselves. He had a desire to depart and be with Christ, but there was nothing morbid about it. It was all based on the revelation that he already had of the rewards that awaited him in the life to come. He tactfully met the Athenians adroitly claiming to be the interpreter of "The unknown god" whose altar they themselves had erected. He never hesitated to avert injustice by claiming his privileges as a Roman citizen. He was the very antithesis of gloominess. In whatever state he was, he had learned to be content. Neither his actions, nor his writings, nor his interested greeting and salutations, show the slightest tincture of melancholia.

(3) *Ignorance.*

This charge could not be laid up against the Apostle. Brought up at the feet of the great Gamaliel, he appeared to be master not only of Jewish, but also of Greek (and Roman) learning.

(4) *Credulity.*

As a resident of Jerusalem, Paul could not be a stranger to the fame of the miracles wrought by Jesus. He had the facts of the resurrection of our Lord, of Pentecost and all the miracles wrought by the Apostles up till the death of Stephen. Far from being credulous, he had barred his mind against every proof and refused to believe. "Nothing less than the irresistible evidence of *his own senses,* clear from all possibility of doubt, could have overcome his unbelief."

(5) *Vanity or self-conceit.*

Vanity and fanaticism usually go together. Men of this type flatter themselves that on account of their superior worth they are the recipients of extraordinary favors and gifts from God, and of these they make their boast. There is not one word in his Epistles, nor one act recorded in his life, in which the slightest mark of this appears. When compelled to vindicate his apostolic claim from wanton attack he does it effec-

tively, but in the briefest way and with many apologies for being compelled to speak thus of himself. (2 Cor. 11:1-30.) When he had a vision of heaven, he modestly withheld his own name and covered it up in the third person. For fourteen years he observed absolute silence in regard to this special mark of the divine favor. (2 Cor. 12:1-12.) Would this be the way a vain man would act? Neither is Paul that planteth, nor Apollos that watereth, anything, but God who gives the increase. (1 Cor. 3:4-7.) Instead of self-conceit, he writes of himself in terms of the most complete abnegation. Everywhere it is "not I, but the grace of God that was with me." (1 Cor. 15:10.) His modesty appears on every page.

(6) But now suppose that in some way wholly unaccountable, Paul had actually been swept away by enthusiasm at the time, and imposed on himself, by imagining the events that took place. Lyttelton's reply is that such a thing was impossible. He here uses the argument that has since been employed so effectively to dispose of Renan's vision theory of the resurrection of our Lord. In such circumstances men always see what they expect to see. An imagined vision will be in accord with the opinions already imprinted on one's mind. Paul's purpose was clearly fixed. At his own request he had been clothed with authority to persecute the Christians, and he was now on his way from Jerusalem to Damascus on this very errand. He looked upon Christ as an impostor and a blasphemer who had justly been put to death. All his passions were inflamed to the highest degree against His followers. He started on his northward journey "breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord" (Acts 9:1). "And being exceedingly mad against them, I persecuted them even unto foreign cities" (Acts 26:11) "There was the pride of supporting a part he had voluntarily engaged in, and the credit he found it procured him among the chief priests and rulers, whose commission he bore." In these circumstances

a wild enthusiast might indeed imagine he saw a vision, but it would be one urging him onward to do the thing which he had started out to accomplish. With nothing having happened to change his opinions or alter the bent of his mind, it would be as impossible for him, in a moment, to have imagined the complete revolution that is recorded in the New Testament as it would be for a rapid river to "carry a boat against the current of its own stream." We might add, as well expect the mighty rushing river itself, without any cause to stop in its course and rush violently backward up a steep mountain side, as to expect the whole current of Paul's thought and feeling and imagination and purpose to be instantly reversed without any cause. It could not take place. And it would have been just as impossible for all those who were with him to have experienced the same delusion, for they also saw the light above the brightness of the noonday sun and they heard the voice from heaven, although they understood not the words. But suppose it were a meteor that burst upon them? How then account for the words that Paul heard speaking in the Hebrew tongue and the dialogue which followed? How account for his going to a certain spot in Damascus, in accordance with instructions here received? How account for the knowledge that Ananias had, and that led to their interview? How account for the miracle after three days whereby Paul's blindness was healed? And how account for the mighty works and wonders afterward wrought by Paul, all consequent on this first revelation? [Following the suggestion of, perhaps, Krenkel, a New England professor is credited with teaching that at his conversion Paul had simply an epileptic attack. But, had all the company that were with him a like attack at the same instant, for they all saw something? And, moreover, no disorder of this or any other kind can account for the facts in the case. Paul's marvelous life-work revolutionized the history of his age, and his influence is powerfully felt yet, after nearly two thousand years, all

over the world. One is almost tempted to say that if such is the result of an attack of epilepsy, what a pity that such a professor as this had not a similar attack. Then possibly he, too, might yet be heard from in the world.]

III. PAUL WAS NOT DECEIVED BY OTHERS

This third possible solution Lyttelton dismisses with a single page. The fraud of others could not have deceived him; for, (1) It was morally impossible that the disciples of Christ could have thought of such a fraud at the instant of Paul's greatest fury against them.

(2) It was physically impossible for them to do it. Could they produce a light brighter than the midday sun; cause him to hear a voice speaking out of that light; make him blind for three days and then return his sight at a word, etc.? There were no Christians around when the miracle of his conversion took place.

(3) No fraud could have produced those subsequent miracles which he himself actively wrought and to which he so confidently appealed in proof of his divine mission.

IV. CHRISTIANITY A DIVINE REVELATION

Our author considers that he has furnished sufficient evidence to show (1) that Paul was not an impostor deliberately proclaiming what he knew to be false with intent to deceive; (2) that he was not imposed upon by an overheated imagination, and (3) that he was not deceived by the fraud of others. Unless, therefore, we are prepared to lay aside the use of our understanding and all the rules of evidence by which facts are determined, we must accept the whole story of Paul's conversion as literally and historically true. We have therefore the supernatural, and the Christian religion is proved to be a revelation from God.

Endeavoring as closely as possible to follow the original and yet considerably in my own language, I have sought to give

the essence of Lord Lyttelton's matchless argument which has been blessed to thousands of doubting souls. May this outline lead to candid examination, as such an examination should inevitably lead to Him whom Paul saw in the midst of the glory near the gate of Damascus.

CHAPTER XVIII

CHRISTIANITY, NO FABLE

BY REV. THOMAS WHITELAW, M. A., D. D.,
KILMARNOCK, SCOTLAND

I. The first mark of the truthfulness of Christianity is to be found in

ITS SUPREME EXCELLENCE

as a Religious System. The unapproachable beauty and resistless charm of its conception, and the unique character of the means by which it seeks to carry out its aims, are not reconcilable with the notion of Fable.

If, however, notwithstanding, Christianity is a Fable, then it is the Divinest Fable ever clothed in human speech. Nothing like it can be found in the literature of the world. Paul only spoke the unvarnished truth when he declared that eye had not seen nor ear heard, neither had the mind of man conceived the things which God had revealed to men in the Gospel.

NOT OF HUMAN ORIGIN

1. The very conception of the Gospel as a scheme for rescuing a lost world from the guilt and power of Sin, for transforming men into servants of righteousness, followers of Christ, and children of God, each one resembling Himself and partaking of His nature, and for eventually lifting them up into a state of holy and blessed immortality like that in which He Himself dwells—that conception never took its rise in the brains of a human fable monger, and least of all in that of a crafty priest or political deceiver—no, not even in that of the best and most brilliantly endowed thinker, poet, prophet or philosopher that ever lived. Men do not write novels and compose fictions in order to redeem their fellows from guilt and

sin, to comfort and support them in death, and to prepare them for immortality. Even those who regard Christianity as being based on delusions and deceptions do not assert that the object of its instructors was anything so lofty and spiritual, but rather that its fabricators sought thereby to enrich themselves by imposing on their credulous fellows, blinding them to the truth by setting before them fictions as if they were facts, frightening them with ghostly terrors and so securing a hold upon their services or their means. The latest sensation provided by German speculation as to the origin of Christianity is that it was manufactured in Rome in the time of Trajan, i. e., about the beginning of the second century, in order to help on a great liberation movement amongst the Jewish slave proletariat against their tyrannical masters, and that in fact it was an imaginary compound of Roman Socialism, Greek Philosophy and Jewish Messiahism. Neither of these, however, is the account furnished by Christianity itself in its accredited documents, of its aim, which, as already stated, is to deliver men from sin and death. The very grandeur of this aim proves that Christianity has not emanated from the mind of man, but must have proceeded from the heart of God. And it may be safely contended that Infinite Wisdom and Love makes no use of fables and deceptions, legends and fictions to further its purposes and realize its aims.

2. If, in addition, the details of the Christian Scheme be considered, that is to say, the particular means by which it proposes to effect its aim, it will further appear that the idea of fiction and fable must be laid aside and that of reality and truth set in its place. It will not be seriously questioned that the details of the Christian Scheme are substantially and briefly these: (1) that God in infinite love and out of pure grace, from eternity purposed to provide salvation for the fallen race of man; (2) that in order to carry out that purpose He sent His own Son, only begotten and well-beloved, the

brightness of His Glory and the express image of His Person, into this world in the likeness of sinful flesh, to die for men's sins, thereby rendering satisfaction for the same, and to rise again from the dead, thereby showing that God had accepted the Sacrifice and could on the ground of it be just and the justifier of the ungodly, as well as bringing life and immortality to light; and (3) that on the ground of this atoning work Salvation is offered to all on the sole condition of faith. This being so, can any one for a moment believe that forgers and fable-mongers would or could have invented so divine a tale? All experience certifies the contrary.

Whensoever men have attempted to construct schemes of Salvation, they have not sought the origin of these schemes in God but in themselves. Human schemes have always been plans by which men might be able to save themselves, with such salvation as they have supposed themselves to need—not always a Salvation from sin and death; more frequently a salvation from material poverty, bodily discomfort, mental ignorance and generally temporal needs. Nor have they ever dreamt of a salvation that should come to them through the mediation of another, and certainly not of God Himself in the Person of His Son; but always of a salvation through their own efforts. Never of a Salvation by grace through faith and therefore free; but always of a Salvation by works and through merit and therefore as a debt—a Salvation by outward forms and magical rites, or by education and culture.

WHO INVENTED IT?

3. Then, it may be added: If the Christian Scheme is a fable, who invented the idea of an Incarnation? For to Jewish minds at any rate such an idea was foreign, being forbidden by their strong monotheism. Who put together the picture of Jesus as it appears in the Gospels? Who conceived the notion of making it that of a sinless man, and doing it so successfully that all subsequent generations of beholders, with a

few exceptions at most, have regarded Him as sinless? Yet a sinless man had never been seen before nor has ever been beheld since His appearance. Who supplied this Jesus with the superhuman power that performed works only possible to God, and with the superhuman wisdom that fell from His lips, if such wisdom was never spoken but only imagined? It is universally allowed that the power and wisdom of Jesus have never been surpassed or even equalled. Whose was the daring genius that struck out the notion not merely of making atonement for Sin, but of doing this by Christ's giving His life a ransom for many and demonstrating its reality through His rising from the dead? These conceptions were so incredible to His followers at the first and have been so unacceptable to natural man since that it is hard to believe any fable-monger would have selected them for his work, even though they had occurred to him. And who suggested the doctrine of a general resurrection at the end of time?—a doctrine to which unaided human science or philosophy has never been able to attain.

The impartial reasoner must perceive that in all these themes we are dealing not with purely human thoughts but with thoughts that are divine and that it is idle to talk of them as fabulous or untrue. "God is not a man that He should lie." He is neither a tyrant that He should seek to oppress men, nor a false priest that He should want to cheat men, nor a novel-writer that He should study to amuse men, but a Father whose dearest interest is to save men, who is Light and in Him is no darkness at all, and whose words are like Himself, the same yesterday, today and forever.

II. The second mark of truthfulness in the Christian Scheme is

ITS PERFECT ADAPTATION

to the end for which it was designed.

1. Assuming for the moment that the Christian System is entirely a product of the human mind, or a pure fabrication,

the question to be considered is, Whether it is at all likely that it would perfectly answer the end for which it was intended. If that end was to deceive men in order to enslave and degrade them, then its concocters have signally outwitted themselves; for no sooner does a man accept Christianity than he finds that if he is deceived thereby, it is a blessed deception which makes it impossible to keep him in subjection or degradation since it illuminates his understanding, purifies his heart, cleanses his imagination, quickens his conscience, strengthens his will and ennobles his whole nature. "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free," said Christ. On the other hand if its end was to do this very thing, then undoubtedly its end has been reached; but the mere fact that it has been reached shows that the Scheme has not proceeded from the human mind as a work of fiction, but from the heart of God as a Scripture of truth.

2. If there be one thing more characteristic of man's works than another, it is imperfection. Magnificent as some of man's inventions have been, few of them are absolutely free from defects, and those that are freest have been brought to their present state of excellence only by slow and short stages and after repeated modifications and improvements—witness the printing press, the steam engine, telegraphy, electrical power and lighting, musical instruments, aeroplanes, etc. And what is more, however perfect any human invention may appear to be at the present moment, there is no guarantee that it will not be in time superseded by something more adapted to the end it has in view.

The case, however, is different with God's works which like Himself, are all perfect; and if it shall turn out on examination that the Christian System is perfectly adapted to the end it has in view, viz., Salvation, and has never needed to be changed, modified or improved, then the inference will be unavoidable that it is God's work and not man's, and as a consequence not a fiction but a fact, not fable but truth.

I am aware that at the present moment there are those who declare that Christianity is played out, that it has served its day, that it has lost its hold on men's minds and will require to give place to some other panacea for the ills of life. But for the most part that is the cry of those who have not themselves tried Christianity and hardly understand what it means. And in any case no effective substitute for Christianity has ever been put forward by its opponents or critics. Nor has any attempt to modify or improve Christianity as a system of religious doctrine ever been successful. Perhaps one of the most strenuous efforts in this direction has been that of so-called liberal (alias rationalistic) theology which seeks to divest Christianity of all its supernatural elements, and in particular of its divine-human Jesus by reducing Him to the dimensions of an ordinary man—in which case it is obvious, the whole superstructure of Christianity would fall to the ground. Yet a contributor to the Hibbart Journal (Jan. 1910) who himself does not accept orthodox Christianity writes of "The Collapse of Liberal Christianity," and frankly confesses that "the simple Jesus of Liberal Christianity cannot be found," which amounts to an admission that the picture of Jesus in the Gospels as a Divine Man, a supernatural Christ, is no fiction but a sublime truth.

3. A detailed examination of the Christian Scheme shows that means better fitted to secure its ends could not have been devised.

a. It will not be denied that part of the aim of Christianity is to restore mankind in general and individuals in particular to the favor and fellowship of God, out of which they have been cast by sin. Whether the Bible is right in its explanation of the origin of sin need not now be argued. Common observation as well as individual conscience testifies to the fact of sin; and the disastrous condition of the race induced by sin Christianity proposes to remedy—not by telling men that sin is only a figment of the imagination

(which men know better than believe); or, if a reality, so trifling a matter that God will overlook it (which men in their best moments doubt); and certainly not by asking men to save themselves (which they soon discover they cannot do); but by first setting forth sin in all its moral loathsomeness and legal guiltiness, and then announcing that God Himself had provided a lamb for a burnt-offering, even His own Son, upon whom He has laid the iniquity of us all, and that now He is in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing unto men their trespasses.

b. A second thing proposed by Christianity is to make men holy, to free them from the love and practice of sin, to conform them in the love and practice of truth and righteousness; and this it seeks to do by giving man a new heart and a right spirit, by changing his nature, implanting in it holy principles and putting it under the government of the divine and eternal spirit.

That the means are adequate has been proved by the experience of the past nineteen centuries, in which millions of human souls have been translated out of darkness into light and turned from the service of Satan to the service of the Living God. And what is more, other methods have been tried without effecting any permanent transformation of either hearts or lives. Magical incantations, meaningless mummeries, laborious ceremonies, painful penances, legislations, education, philanthropy, have in turn been resorted to, but in vain. Never once has the Gospel method been fairly tried and proved inefficient.

c. A third thing Christianity engages to do, is to confer on those who accept it a blessed immortality—to support them when they come to die, to cheer them with the prospect of a happy existence while their bodies are in the grave, to bring those bodies forth again and in the end to bestow on their whole personality a glorious unending life beneath a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness

And Christianity does this by first securing its adherents a title to eternal life through the obedience unto death of Christ, next by making them meet for the inheritance through the indwelling and operation of Christ's spirit, then by opening for them the gates of immortality through Christ's resurrection, and finally by Christ's coming for them at the end of the age.

Now can anything more complete be thought of as a Scheme of Salvation? Is there any part of it that is not exactly fitted to its place and suited to its end? So far is this from being the case that not a single pin can be removed from the building without bringing down the whole superstructure. Abstract from Christianity the Incarnation, or the Atonement, or the Resurrection, or the Exaltation, or the Future coming, and its framework is shattered. Take away Pardon or Purity or Peace or Sonship or Heaven, and its value as a system of religion is gone. But these are not assertions that will hold good of fables and fictions, myths and legends, which might all be tampered with, taken from or added to, without endangering their worth. Hence, it is fair to argue, that a scheme so admirably adjusted in all its parts, so complete in its provisions and so exquisitely adapted to its design, could only have emanated from the mind of Him who is wonderful in counsel and excellent in working, who is the true God and the Eternal Life.

III. A third mark of truthfulness in the Christian system is

ITS CONSPICUOUS SUCCESS

in effecting the end for which it was designed.

Had Christianity been a baseless imagination, or a superstitious legend, is there reason to suppose either that it would have lived so long or that it would have achieved the wonders it has done during the past nineteen centuries—either upon individuals or upon the world at large? It is true

that mere length of time in which a religion has prevailed when considered by itself, is no sufficient guarantee of the truth of that religion, else Buddhism would possess a higher certificate of truthfulness than Christianity; but when viewed in connection with the beneficial results in elevating mankind, both individually and collectively, which have followed from a religion, the length of time during which it has continued is no small testimony to its truth. Still the practical effects of a religion upon individuals and upon the world at large, as has been said, forms an argument in its favor which cannot easily be set aside.

1. As to the INDIVIDUAL. Had the facts upon which Christianity is based been purely fictitious, had the story of the Incarnation, Death and Resurrection of Jesus been only a legend, and had the promise of pardon, purity and peace, of everlasting life and glory which Christianity holds out to men been a deception instead of a verity, does any one imagine it would have effected the transformations it has wrought on individual hearts and lives? I remember that the first lie told by the devil in Eden plunged the whole race of mankind into spiritual death. I have yet to learn that a lie hatched by even good people can save men from perdition and lift them to heaven, can bless them with inward happiness and assure them of divine favor, can comfort them in sorrow, strengthen them in weakness, sustain them in death and fit them for eternity. And yet that is what Christianity can do—has done in past ages to millions who have tried it, and is doing to-day to thousands who are trying it. It will take more than has been said by critics and scoffers to persuade me that these things have been done by a fable. I have heard of fables and fictions, legends and superstitions amusing men and women, diverting them when wearied, occupying them when idle, taking their thoughts off serious matters, and even helping them to shut their eyes against death's approach; I never heard of their bringing souls to God, assuring them of His favor,

cleansing them from sin, blessing them with peace, preparing them for eternity. But these again are what Christianity can do and does; and so I reason it is not a fable, but a fact, not a legend but a history, not an imaginary tale, but a solid truth.

2. And when to this I add what it has done on the BROAD THEATRE OF THE WORLD, my faith in its truth is confirmed. Nineteen centuries ago Christianity started out on its conquering career. It had neither wealth nor power, nor learning, nor social influence, nor imperial patronage upon its side. It was despised by the great ones of the earth as a superstition. It was looked upon by Jew and Gentile as subversive of religion and morals. Its adherents were collected from the dregs of the population, from the poor and the ignorant (at least in the world's estimation); and its apostles were a humble band, mostly of fishermen—though they soon had their ranks enlarged by the accession of one (Paul) whose mental force and religious earnestness were worth to Christianity whole battalions of common disciples or of average preachers. But what was one, even though he was an intellectual and spiritual giant, to the mighty task set before it of conquering the world and making all nations obedient to the Faith? Yet that task was immediately taken in hand and with what success the annals of the past centuries declare.

In the first century, which may be called the Apostolic Age, it practically defeated Judaism, by establishing itself as an organized religion, not in Palestine alone, but in Asia Minor, and in some of the chief cities of Europe. To this it was no doubt helped by the destruction of Jerusalem in the year 70 by the armies of Titus; but the undermining of Judaism was being gradually brought about by the spread of the Christian Faith.

In the next two centuries, which may be called the Age of the Fathers, it overcame paganism, substituting in wide

circles the worship of Jesus for the worship of heathen divinities and of the Roman Emperor. Not without passing through fierce tribulation in the long succession of persecutions with which it was assailed did it achieve the victory, but in its experience was repeated the experience of Israel in Egypt—"the more it was afflicted the more it multiplied and grew," so that by the end of the third and the beginning of the fourth century it had within its pale about a fifth of the Roman Empire.

From that time on Christianity applied itself to the task of making nominal Christians into real ones; and but for the mercy of God at the Reformation it might have been defeated But God's Spirit brooded upon the moral and spiritual waste as erst He did upon the material in the beginning, and God's Word said—"Let there be light!" and there was light. Luther in Germany, Calvin in Geneva, and Knox in Scotland, with others in different parts arose as champions of the Truth and recalled men's thoughts to the simplicities and certainties of the Gospel; and a great awakening overspread the nominally Christian world.

Thereafter Christianity took a forward step among the nations; and is now doing for the world what no other religion has done or can do—neither Buddhism, nor Confucianism, nor Mohammedanism—what no modern substitute for Christianity can do—whether materialism, or agnosticism, or spiritism, or socialism; and just because of this we may rest assured that Christianity is no cunningly devised fable but a divinely revealed truth—that it alone contains hope for the world, as a whole, and for generation after generation as it passes, and that the day will yet come when it will fill the globe.

In short, when one remembers that Christianity has built up the Christian church and that the Christian church has been the most powerful factor in creating modern civilization, it becomes an impossibility to credit the allegation or even to harbor the suspicion, that it is founded on a lie. By

its fruits it may be tested. Notwithstanding the imperfections that adhere to the Christian church, so far as it is a human institution, few will deny that its existence in the world has been productive of preponderatingly good results; and on that certificate alone it may be claimed that the Christianity of which the church is a concrete and living embodiment is no "cunningly devised fable" but a "Scripture of Truth."

Fundamental Books on The Lord's Return

Addresses on Prophecy, By C. I. Scofield. Paper ..... $ .25
God's purpose in this age; the Church of God; Israel: past, present, and future; the great tribulation; the Millennium; the future state, etc.

After This I Will Return. By Rev. J. H. Townsend, D. D. Cloth boards ..... .40
A helpful little volume on the second coming of Christ.

Apocalypse of Jesus Christ, The. By Willis W. Mead. Cloth 1.00
This work has been received with great cordiality, and has been given strong and hearty testimonials.

Apocalypse of Jesus Christ, The. By J. A. Seiss, D. D. 3 vols. 1400 pages. Cloth, only 1.80
Written in an easy, instructive style. Very edifying.

Behold, He Cometh! By Rev. Luther Rees. Paper, 15c; cloth .25
One of the very best concise presentations of the second coming.

Blessed Hope, The. By Edward Dennett. Cloth ..... .35
Papers on the Lord's coming and connected events.

Brightening East, The. By Rev. J. H. Townsend, D. D. Cloth ..... .40
A brief and clear treatise on the fulfillment of prophecy, especially in relation to the Jews and the events preceding the coming of our Lord.

Bright Tomorrow, A. By Rev. J. H. Townsend, D. D. Cloth ..... .40
Chapters dealing with prophecy in its bearing upon Eastern affairs, in its relation to our social and religious life, and in its relation to Israel; also, a chapter upon the Advent viewed from a missionary standpoint.

Call of the Bride, The, and other Gospel Papers. By W. T. P. W. Cloth ..... .40
The first five chapters are based upon the twenty-fourth chapter of Genesis, which is taken as a pictorial representation of the time in which we live: Eliezer, the prayerful messenger; Isaac, the bridegroom; Rebekah, the bride. The remaining pages are heartsearching chapters on redemption.

God's Methods With Man In Time: Past, Present and Future. By Rev. G. Campbell Morgan. 188 pages. Cloth 1.00
"With firm, clear and reverent touch Mr. Morgan sketches the story of God's dealings with man in time, past, present and future. It is a solemn and suggestive book, and its author does not think it necessary to to apologize for the Almighty, but bows with glad assent to the will of the Supreme Ruler. A colored diagram sets forth the course and order of events. Mr. Morgan does not fall into the error of prying into times and seasons." — **The Episcopal Recorder.**

Christ and Israel. By Dr. Adolph Saphir. Cloth 1.25
The author, though converted to Christ when only a lad, and well acquainted with all modern philosophies and learned in the wisdom of the Gentiles and especially called to minister to them, did not cease to be a Hebrew of the Hebrews nor to yearn in pity over his own nation. He pictures their restoration at the second coming of Christ.

Christ Is Coming: How? and When? By T. H. Salmon. Cloth ..... .65
An explanation of the Scripture passages dealing with the second coming of Christ

Christ's Coming Again. By William Kelly. Cloth 1.20
A reliable treatise on the rapture of the saints, the future tribulation, and the "heavenly hope."

Christ's Return. By St. Clement. Paper ..... .25
God's plan for bringing the earth and its inhabitants back into harmony with Himself.

Coming Glories, or Plain Answers to Seventy-six Prophetic and Other Questions. By W. Scott. Paper, 15c; cloth boards ..... .30
A large amount of practical and definite information is contained within the covers of this little volume.

THE BIOLA BOOK ROOM
Bible Institute of Los Angeles
536-558 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, California

The prices of all of these books are subject to change without notice.

Fundamental Books on The Lord's Return

Coming of the Day of God, The. By Rev. J. Hubert Brooke, M. A. Cloth boards ..... .40

Four excellent addresses bearing upon the fact of the second coming, the signs of our Lord's return, the effects of His coming, and hastening the coming.

Coming of the Lord, The. By Capt. W. H. Dawson. Cloth ..... .40

Another good book on this subject.

Coming of the Lord, The. By Arthur T. Pierson, D. D. Paper .25

Two argumentative papers showing the coming of the Lord to be both the doctrinal and the practical center of the Bible.

Coming One, The. By Rev. A. B. Simpson. Cloth 1.00

The author writes convincingly and positively.

Coming Prince, The; or, The Seventy Weeks of Daniel. (7th edition). By Sir Robert Anderson, K. C. B. 304 pp., cloth..... 1.50

A comprehensive explanation of Daniel's great prophecy.

Deepening Shadows and Coming Glories. By A. Sims. Cloth..... 1.00

An outline of the wonderful events to transpire in the Church and the world from the appearing of Christ to the close of the millennial age.

Ecce Venit (Behold He Cometh!) By A. J. Gordon, D. D. Cloth.... 1.25

Another excellent work covering the prophecy, the delay, and the fulfillment, including the events of the latter days.

Eight Lectures on Prophecy. By W. Trotter. Paper, 35c; cloth .60

The second coming of Christ premillennial, the return of the Jews, the millennial reign of Christ, the distinct calling and glory of the Church, the predicted corruption of Christianity, etc.

Elocile, or the King's Return, By Mildred Edwards. Cloth..... .50

This is a thrilling love story told in blank verse. It shows glory of the second coming of Jesus Christ and the terrors of the tribulation. James M. Gray says: "The work reveals a marvelous breadth of vision and depth of insight touching the dispensational teaching of the Bible, to say nothing of the exquisite literary form of its expression."

End of the Bible, The. Mrs. John Stewart Oliphant. Neatly bound in red cloth 1.40

A book on prophecy for young Christians, beginning with the earliest fulfilled prophecies and leading up to those which have not yet been fulfilled. Written in an easy, conversational style.

Epistles of the Advent. By Rev, A. B. Simpson. Paper ..... .25

A helpful little book.

Exposition of the Revelation: and Prophetic Outlines. By Walter Scott. 468 pp. Substantially bound 2.00

A scholarly treatise on this important book. The subject is handled in a clear, intensely interesting manner. The author interprets the book with other prophetic parts of Scripture and displays "An elaborate scheme, so symmetrical, so unique, so perfect and consistent in its outlines, and so exact in detail, that God alone **must** be the Author of it."

Forgotten Truths. By Sir Robert Anderson, K. C. B. Cloth..... 1.25

Chapters on the Lord's coming and other themes. A definite and systematic statement of some of the questions involved in present day discussions.

From Advent to Advent. By C. E. Stuart. Cloth 1.25

A commentary on the Gospel according to Luke. The book contains 336 pages.

THE BIOLA BOOK ROOM
Bible Institute of Los Angeles
536-558 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, California

The prices of all of these books are subject to change without notice.

Fundamental Books on The Lord's Return

From the Rapture to the Manifestation. By Alfred Page. Paper .20
The Rapture, the Bema, Heavenly glories, the Marriage, the Manifestation.

Glorious Appearing of the Saviour, The. By Rev. J. Gosset-Tanner, M. A. Cloth .50
This is an expository work, leading its readers to the "more sure Word of prophecy," and applying its message with simplicity and force; but the author also passes in review recent and current events, and quotes freely from contemporary writers, showing how these all offer clear indications of the coming Day.

Glorious Future, That. By Rev. J. L. Thompson. Cloth 1.25
This is a key to the Revelation of Jesus Christ which was written by John, the apostle. Each vision is specifically treated. Passages from the Revelation are quoted in full, and are followed by clear expositions.

God's Methods With Man In Time; Past, Present and Future. By Rev. G. Campbell Morgan. 188 pages. Cloth 1.00
"With firm, clear and reverent touch Mr. Morgan sketches the story of God's dealings with man in time, past, present and future. It is a solemn and suggestive book, and its author does not think it necessary to apologize for the Almighty, but bows with glad assent to the will of the Supreme Ruler. A colored diagram sets forth the course and order of events. Mr. Morgan does not fall into the error of prying into times and seasons." — **The Episcopal Recorder.**

God's Oath. By Dr. Ford C. Ottman. Cloth 1.25
This is a study of an unfulfilled promise of God. It is a practical interpretation of the prophets and a study of the spiritual life of the Old and New Testaments.

Good Shepherd, The. Finding His Sheep. By Adolph Saphir. Cloth .75
Highly commended by the late D. L. Moody.

Great Prophecies, of the Centuries Concerning Israel and the Gentiles, The. By G. H. Pember, M. A. 467 pages, together with a valuable appendix and a helpful index. Cloth 2.50
There are two colored charts, one of the prophecies of Daniel, and one of the prophecies of Moses, Balaam, and Ahijah. This is a vigorous call for a halt in the wild career of "modern thought," which is carrying off old landmarks, sweeping away settled opinions which have been made for the peace of the world, and submerging all the lessons of past history.

Heaven Opened. By Rev. A. B. Simpson. Paper .25
Christ in the Apocalypse. The vision of the churches. The throne, the lamb and the seals. The trumpets and the tribulations. The mother Church and the man child. The two beasts. The first-fruits and the harvest.

He Cometh! By Rev. H. W. Webb-Peploe, M. A. Cloth 1.00
The return of Christ treated in relation to Himself, the Church, the world, and to God.

His Last Word. By Mrs. M. Baxter. Cloth .50
A book of suggestions for Bible students whose aim in life is to fulfill the Word of God and to prepare for Christ's coming.

How Is Jesus Coming? And for Whom? By Rev. Robert Middleton. Cloth .40
A simple and systematic study of the last days before the second coming of our Lord.

THE BIOLA BOOK ROOM
Bible Institute of Los Angeles
536-558 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, California

The prices of all of these books are subject to change without notice.

Fundamental Books on The Lord's Return

"I Am Coming." By Rev. James H. Brookes, D. D. Cloth 65

A series of addresses showing our Lord's teaching concerning His second advent, the teaching of the Apostles, the course of this age, and dealing with the antichrist, the rapture, and "the Blessed Hope."

"In the Twinkling of an Eye." By Sydney Watson. Cloth ..... .75

A tale founded upon future fact. A well-written, interesting plot leads naturally and easily to the time of the Lord's coming in the air for His saints, and includes the realization of that experience.

Imperialism and Christ. By Ford C. Ottman, D. D. Handsomely bound in red-grained cloth. 12mo, 317 pp. 1.25

A scriptural, logical, and thorough discussion of the evolution, constitution, and character of the coming kingdom of Christ.

Jesus Is Coming. By W. E. Blackstone. Paper, 25c; cloth . . .50

All Christians who desire the right outlook on life and the right incentive to soul winning should come under the influence of the teaching of this book.

Last Days. By A. G. Morgan. Cloth 1.00

This covers the prophetical portion of the Revelation. The addresses are written in the form of studies, in simple language, and are within the reach of young Bible students.

Last Times, The. Joseph A. Seiss, D. D. Cloth 1.25

An especially sane and calm discussion of the prophecies concerning Christ's personal return to the earth, together with the circumstances preceding and following that event. It is supplemented by a valuable chronology and an excellent chapter on the authorities, books, and references on the advent and the millenium.

Lectures on Daniel, the Prophet. By H. A. Ironside. Cloth . 1.00

A helpful chart, accompanies this volume. The author says: "To the Christian, the book of Daniel must ever be a precious and soul-stirring record of the love and care of our gracious God, . . . until the day dawn and the day-star arise in our hearts." Some often-heard questions and objections are answered in the appendix.

Lectures on Revelation. By William Lincoln. Cloth 1.00

Terse exposition of the whole Book of Revelation. Strongly commended.

Lectures on the Book of Daniel. By William Kelly. Cloth .... .75

Running through the explanation of these prophecies is the ever recurring silver thread leading to the comings of Christ: the first, to meet the saints, and the second appearance upon the earth.

Lectures on the Book of Revelation. By William Kelly. 502 pp. Cloth 2.25

The lectures are preceded by a translation from a text drawn from the best manuscripts. Nineteen chapters deal with the events preceding and succeeding the return of our Lord. The subject is dealt with in a scholarly, exhaustive manner.

Lectures on the Second Coming. By J. N. Darby. Cloth 50

This work takes up specifically the following chapters from Holy Writ: First Thessalonians I, Ephesians I, Revelation XII, Romans XI, Matthew XIII, Daniel II and Daniel VII.

Lessons of the Ages, The. By F. W. Grant. Paper ..... .20

A standard work on this important subject.

THE BIOLA BOOK ROOM
Bible Institute of Los Angeles
536-558 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, California

The prices of all of these books are subject to change without notice.

Fundamental Books on The Lord's Return

Letters of Jesus, The. By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D., LL. D. Cloth 1.00
The Letters to the Seven Churches. Dr. Seiss deals faithfully with the divine Word and avoids doubtful speculation. His style is clear and positive. The perusal of this book will leave the earnest Christian more eager than ever before to be watching and ready for the summons: "Come up hither."

Light on the Last Days. By Rev. Charles A. Blanchard, D. D. Paper, 25c; cloth ..... .75
A usable book on The Revelation of Jesus Christ. The author's style is constructive—not controversial. He emphasizes the importance of the teaching of the Revelation and the inexcusableness of the ignorance and indifference of many Christians concerning it.

Looking Forward. By Rev. Geo. C. and Mrs. Needham. Paper .... .35
Will Jesus come? After the Advent. The new earth.

Lord's Coming, The, Israel and the Church. By T. B. Baines. Cloth ..... .85
A convincing exposition of all Scripture, relating to the coming of the Lord, first for His Church and second as Judge and King.

Lord's Return, The, Seen in History and in Scripture as Pre-Millennial and Imminent. By Jesse Forest Silver. Cloth 1.00
Bishop Wilson T. Hogue says: "The reader will find here the result of long and laborious research on a subject of vast importance to the entire world."

Lord's Return and Kindred Truth, The. By L. W. Munhall, M. A., D. D. Cloth 1.00
This is an able work showing the nature and imminence of His return, and the value of the doctrine. It also treats of the resurrection, the judgments, the devil, and Israel's earthly inheritance. A chapter—"Objections Answered"—and an appendix, should serve to settle many disputed points.

Man's Day. By Philip Mauro. Cloth 1.00
The author compares and contrasts the present with the past and future periods of time, and describes, in the light of God's Word, the real characteristics of the age in which we live.

"Mark of the Beast, The." By Sydney Watson. Cloth ..... .75
Fiction. Many who will not read the Word may be induced to read this, and will be led by the interest of these well-written pages into mines of hitherto undiscovered truth. It is a vivid description of the times following the translation of the saints, and makes this teaching a living, future reality.

"Morning Cometh, The." By Rev. David James Burrell, D. D. Cloth ..... .75
A masterly comparison of the earliest history with modern times, showing the fruition of God's plans. While the one general thought runs through the book, each chapter is complete in itself, and furnishes food for profitable meditation and practical Christian living.

Notes on Daniel. By William Kelly. Paper, 40c; cloth ..... .75
A most valuable and lucid exposition of the prophecies of this book with practical applications of its moral lessons.

Notes on the Book of Revelation. Rev. Albert Barnes. Cloth ..... .75
The text of the entire Revelation is given with elaborate notes in fine print.

Number of Man The; or the Climax of Civilization. By Philip Mauro. New popular edition, 12mo, cloth ..... .75
A startling arraignment of the man-made conditions which are combining their influence to destroy Christianity.

Plain Papers on Prophetic Subjects. By W. Trotter. 600 pages, cloth 1.25
Contents: The heavenly hope; or, What is the hope of the Church? Approaching judgments. The coming crisis and its results. The doom of Christendom. Israel's restoration. Is the millennium or Christ's second advent to be expected first?

THE BIOLA BOOK ROOM
Bible Institute of Los Angeles
536-558 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, California

The prices of all of these books are subject to change without notice.

Fundamental Books on The Lord's Return

Return of the Lord Jesus, The. By R. A. Torrey, D. D. Paper ..... .25
This new book by Dr. Torrey, is a masterly treatment of the most important phases of the second bodily coming of our Lord Jesus.

Revelation, The. William Kelly. Cloth 1.00
A full translation from a revised Greek text is given for the convenience of the reader. This is followed by a commentary, passage by passage.

Revelation of Christ to His Servants, The. By F. W. Grant. Cloth 1.00
Suggestive and valuable to the student of Revelation.

Revelation of Jesus Christ, The. By Rev. D. Wesley Myland. Cloth 1.00
A book which makes some things plain which are sealed to many, and which will bring a blessing both to heart and mind.

Satan and the Saint; or, The Present Darkness and the Coming Light. By Dr. James M. Gray. Paper, 15c; cloth ..... .50
"It is well calculated to be eminently useful in these apostate days."

"Scarlet and Purple:" A Story of Souls and "Signs." By Sydney Watson. Cloth ..... .75
This book deals mainly "with the passage of a soul from death unto life, and also shows the condition of ripeness (or certainly of **ripening)** of Christendom for the coming of the Antichrist.

Second Coming of Christ, The. By Len Broughton. Cloth ..... .50
Full of rich truth.

Things to Come. By John R. Caldwell. Paper, 15c; cloth ..... .50
This book is to be read with an open Bible for continual reference. Beginning with the promises to Abraham, it treats of the chief events in God's plan of the ages so far as revealed in His Holy Word.

Unfulfilled Prophecy. By C. A. Shipman. Neatly bound in blue cloth 1.00
Beginning with the first resurrection, the writer treats of each promised event in succession, quoting the Scripture upon which his conclusions are founded.

Unfolding of the Ages, in the Revelation of John, The. By Ford C. Ottman. Cloth 2.50
This is an exhaustive treatise on the Revelation, chapter by chapter, and verse by verse. It is written in a scholarly manner, and all conclusions are drawn by comparing spiritual things with spiritual. There is both a scriptural and a topical index. The volume (511 pages) is substantially bound and the workmanship admirable.

Visions of John in Patmos, The. By Edward Dennett. Cloth ..... .85
A book which should aid materially in an understanding of the important contents of the last book of the Bible.

When the Saints Are Gone. By Constancia Serjeant. Cloth ..... .75
A romance leading up to the rapture of the Church and covering following events to the visible, personal return of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Wonders of Prophecy, The. By John Urquhart. Cloth ..... .50
The remarkable way in which the Bible predictions concerning the coming, history and work of Christ, and the unique history of the Jewish people, have been fulfilled.

THE BIOLA BOOK ROOM
Bible Institute of Los Angeles
536-558 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, California

The prices of all of these books are subject to change without notice.

3 6877 00044 2953

UPLAND COLLEGE LIBRARY
UPLAND, CALIFORNIA

[redacted]

Date Due

8072

DEC 1 1 '72			
1/21 3:30pm			
2-19/5pm			
DEC — 9 '80			
JAN 8 '90			
JA10'94			
MAY 2 2 2001			

UPLAND COLLEGE LIBRARY
UPLAND, CALIFORNIA

BT
82.2
.F86
1917
v.2

Los Angeles. Bible Institute
of Los Angeles
The fundamentals

8072

HIEBERT LIBRARY
Fresno Pacific College - M.B. Seminary
Fresno, CA 93702